EDINA BECIREVIC

edina becirevic

GENOCIDE ON THE DRINA RIVER

Genocide on the Drina River

This page intentionally left blank

GENOCIDE ON THE DRINA RIVER

Edina Bećirević

Yale
UNIVERSITY
PRESS
New Haven and London

Copyright © 2014 by Edina Bećirević.
All rights reserved.
This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, including illustrations, in any form (beyond that copying permitted by Sections 107 and 108 of the U.S. Copyright Law and except by reviewers for the public press), without written permission from the publishers.

Yale University Press books may be purchased in quantity for educational, business, or promotional use. For information, please e-mail sales.press@yale.edu (U.S. office) or sales@yaleup.co.uk (U.K. office).

Set in Postscript Electra type by IDS Infotech, Ltd.
Printed in the United States of America.

ISBN: 978-0-300-19258-2

Library of Congress Control Number: 2014934004

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

This paper meets the requirements of ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (Permanence of Paper).

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

CONTENTS

Pronunciation vii

Preface ix

Acknowledgments xix

ONE The Framework for Analysis 1

TWO The Dissolution of Yugoslavia and the Propaganda of Dehumanization 16

THREE "Joint Criminal Enterprise" 50

FOUR Genocide in Eastern Bosnia 81

FIVE The Eighth Stage of Genocide—Denial 144

AFTERWORD From Višegrad to Sydney and Back 180

Notes 188

Index 225

This page intentionally left blank

PRONUNCIATION

Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian are similar languages and are considered variants of a common pluricentric language. They are subtly different, and while Bosnian and Croatian use the Latin alphabet, Serbian uses the Cyrillic alphabet. The languages are sometimes referred to as one, abbreviated as B/C/S. Unlike in English, vowels in B/C/S are pronounced consistently, and some letters are marked with diacriticals to indicate their pronunciation. This text uses diacritical marks, and so their pronunciation, as well as the pronunciation of vowels, is indicated below.

a	*a*, as in car
c	*ts*, as in bats
č	*ch*, as in touch
ć	*ch*, as in chamber (this sound is softer than č)
dž	*j*, as in gin
đ	*j*, as in jump (this sound is softer than dž)
e	*a*, as in bay
i	*ee*, as in cheese
j	*y*, as in yes
o	*o*, as in over
r	the *r* is rolled
š	*sh*, as in hush
u	*u*, as in mute
ž	*zh*, as in measure

This page intentionally left blank

PREFACE

When war began in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1992, the international community stood aside and watched as Serbia unleashed an aggression against the country's non-Serb population. Governments around the world ignored concentration camps, mass rape and murder, the destruction of cultural monuments, sieges of cities, and the intentional starvation of civilians—in short, they acted as if they were unaware that genocide was taking place. Instead, they called it a civil war, and they referred to the actions of Serb army forces with the euphemistic term "ethnic cleansing." In doing so, global leaders rationalized their own failure to defend the mandate imposed on them by the U.N. Convention on Genocide of 1948, which outlaws the intentional destruction of a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group "in whole or in part."

In those days, from Sarajevo, it seemed as if the world was divided into two: the world of dominant Western politics, which showed respect for Serbian military power; and the world of civil society, along with a handful of brave international journalists—people like Roy Gutman, Samantha Power, Ed Vulliamy, Christiane Amanpour, and others who risked their lives to report from Bosnia—who saw genocide for what it was.

The establishment of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY) in 1993 brought hope that justice could prevail and that international criminal law, by punishing individual perpetrators, could make up for the mistakes of international politics. Encouraged by the establishment of the ICTY, the Bosnian government brought charges against Serbia in the International Court of Justice, invoking the Genocide Convention in a state-versus-state lawsuit for the first time. The Bosnian people, who had largely lost faith in the idea of justice, turned their gaze toward institutions in which they believed a higher moral ground was unquestionable. But that faith was also fleeting. Though the Tribunal in The Hague was up and running a year into the war, its cells remained empty for the duration of the conflict. In the absence of indictees, judges busied themselves with debates on legal procedures that resulted in unrealistically high standards for proving genocidal intent. Meanwhile, undisturbed, those who committed genocide in Bosnia continued to redden rivers with the blood of innocent non-Serb victims. And those victims, thanks to an arms embargo imposed by the U.N. Security Council, were denied the right to defend themselves.

In three and a half years, the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina claimed around a hundred thousand lives, and it is estimated that at least twenty thousand women were victims of a systematic rape campaign.[1] But in July 1995, the intensity of the killing escalated. After conquering the U.N. "safe area" of Srebrenica, Serb forces killed eight thousand Bosnian Muslim men and boys in just a few days. The scale of the Srebrenica massacre, coupled with the fact that U.N. troops had failed to protect civilians there, forced the international community to finally undertake a military intervention. A bombing campaign was followed by peace talks that resulted in the Dayton Peace Agreement, the construction of which defied all principles of justice. The perpetrators of genocide were rewarded for their crime—they were given half of the prewar territory, and were allowed to transform the self-invented Serb Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina into an officially recognized entity known as Republika Srpska, within the borders of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Toward the end of 1995, after NATO intervention, the term "genocide" finally crossed the threshold of international political, journalistic, and academic discourse, yet only in discussion of events that took place in Srebrenica. The verdicts of both courts in The Hague stayed this course in subsequent years: labeling all crimes prior to Srebrenica as ethnic cleansing, and identifying the killings in and around Srebrenica in July 1995 as genocide.

Like so many Bosnians, a number of unanswered questions haunted me during the war. Why did this happen to us? How could some of my Serb friends join the "other side," to play a role in genocide? As the first bombs fell and the first of my friends were romanced by nationalistic fanatics, I obsessively questioned my childhood memories, trying to find among them the warning signs I'd missed that foretold what was happening to my country in the spring of 1992. But I found no evidence there. Like most Bosnian citizens with strongly rooted liberal and multicultural values, I could not understand why so many Serbs were suddenly attracted to an ideology that promoted an ethnically uniform state.

Before the war started, I believed that we Bosnians lived in the only one of the six Yugoslav republics that maintained a truly multicultural ethic. Unlike other republics, Bosnia and Herzegovina had no dominant majority nation. Bosnian Serbs, Bosnian Croats, and Bosnian Muslims were all constituent peoples with equal rights. Painful memories of the Nazi invasion during World War II—when Bosnia, like other Yugoslav territories, was caught up in a parallel civil war—were covered over with politically motivated silence as Tito promoted the ethics of "brotherhood and unity" instead of implementing a proper reconciliation process. Growing up under Tito's regime, many young people in Bosnia, especially in urban areas, were ignorant of how deeply the wounds of World War II were still felt. Thus, when Milošević's propaganda started in 1987, we could not imagine that it would have such a huge impact on the Serb population; but many serious analysts had warned that after the aggression against Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina would be the next conquest of Serbia and the Yugoslav People's Army. And these armed aggressions were not possible without the support of Serbs inside Croatia and Bosnia.

In retrospect, it is easy to see that war was the most likely development. Still, many in Bosnia—and I was one of them—believed that multinational tolerance would remain intact, that Bosnian Serbs would not fall pray to Milošević's warmongering. But the demons of the past appeared in prewar propaganda in deviously smart ways; and the results were devastating. Bosnian Serbs who were influenced by nationalist propaganda traded the ideal of a peaceful multinational society for one of an ethnically homogenous state, a state that had no place for non-Serbs. Some of my Bosnian Serb friends accepted this nationalist ideology and left Sarajevo, but many others stayed in the city and refused to identify with this exclusively Serb vision. They also suffered the food and water shortages and daily exposure to Serbian shells and snipers; and some of them were killed and injured, together with 11,541 Sarajevans during three and a half years under siege.

I cannot deny that the motivation for writing this book was personal. My life became a nightmare in 1992. After it was over, I was compelled to learn about its causes and to identify the nightmare for what it really was, for the sake of my own sanity. Though I do not shy away from my Bosniak background, I have done my best to establish distance from my emotions while doing research and to adhere to the standards of honest scholarly writing, using respected references, analyzing only documents that were undisputed in the ICTY, and cross-checking all of the key information I learned from the numerous interviews I did with genocide survivors.

I have made no attempt, however, to apply the rules of the fashionable postmodern concept that equates objectivity and neutrality, and therefore gives the same voice to victims and perpetrators. Recently, during his testimony in The Hague—in the trial of wartime Bosnian Serb leader Radovan Karadžić, who is accused of genocide—Ed Vulliamy, a British journalist well known for his coverage of concentration camps in Bosnia, was questioned by Karadžić himself on the issue of objectivity versus neutrality, in an attempt to imply that Vulliamy holds an anti-Serb bias. In turn, Vulliamy tried to explain to the judges the difference between objectivity and neutrality: "I am not neutral between the camp guard and the prisoners, between the raped women and the rapists . . . I can't in all honesty sit here in court and say I am or want to be neutral over this kind of violence."[2] But Vulliamy concluded that not being neutral should not be taken to mean that he was not objective. I must borrow Vulliamy's explanation to clarify my own position as a researcher of Bosnian genocide. For us both, the postmodern construct does not suffice. But that is not to say that this book offers only the perspective of victims.

In fact, a significant part of this book is rooted in perpetrator-based research: the analysis of recorded parliamentary transcripts, taped conversations, and numerous other authentic documents that show that genocide against Bosnian Muslims was planned and implemented not only under the careful watch of Slobodan Milošević, Radovan Karadžić, and Ratko Mladić but also with the full knowledge and participation of a wide circle of Serbian political, security sector, and military actors. Decisions that have resulted from international criminal law proceedings have depicted genocidal intent as something hidden so deeply in the mind of perpetrators that the *mens rea* (criminal intent) of genocide is inevitably difficult to prove. Yet, reading the transcripts of taped conversations, high-level meetings between Serbian political and military elites, and sessions of the Bosnian Serb Assembly, the intent of Serb elites to partially destroy Bosnian Muslims as a group (defined as genocide by the U.N. Convention on Genocide) is plainly clear. And it was clear to the members of the Serb leadership, including General Mladić, who said in May 1992 that since they did not "have a sieve to sift so that only Serbs would stay, or [so] that the Serbs would fall through and the rest leave," the only way to achieve this "would be genocide."[3]

As a commander of the Bosnian Serb forces, Mladić made this comment in the capacity of a strategic planner—he was concerned with whether his forces could get away with genocide, not with the moral question of implementing it. As I perused these transcripts and other research documents, I found myself searching for any signs of remorse or shame. There are some; but they are so rare, and often so ambivalent, that this exercise served only to convince me further that genocide and the many atrocious war crimes committed between 1992 and 1995 were not mere consequences of the war but were the strategic goals of the war itself.

After experiencing the war and genocide in Bosnia, and reporting about it for international media, I broadened my education from the University of Sarajevo by studying media at the London School of Economics and political science at Central European University in Budapest. The core of the empirical research for this book was then done during doctoral studies at the University of Sarajevo, and the final literature review during my time as a Fulbright postdoctoral research scholar at Yale University. These studies have driven my work toward comparative methodological research, for to understand what happened in Bosnia and Herzegovina it is necessary to analyze other cases of genocide throughout history.

Thus, in the first chapter I discuss the evolution of concepts of genocide and different, often conflicting, definitions. Controversies surrounding the term "genocide" have negatively impacted both genocide prevention (if the conflict is not labeled genocide, the international community does not have a duty to intervene) and the prosecution of war criminals in the aftermath of genocide. However, the sociology of genocide does offer consensual points for comparative analysis. From empirical studies of different cases of genocide in world history, a pattern of common features emerges. It is within this methodological framework that I set my analysis of events in Bosnia and Herzegovina from 1992 to 1995, with a special focus on genocide in seven eastern Bosnian municipalities during 1992 and 1993.

The main argument of this book challenges the entrenched view that the only genocide of the Bosnian War occurred in Srebrenica in July 1995, and that mass killings in the region around Srebrenica and in other regions in Bosnia and Herzegovina prior to that can "only" be called "ethnic cleansing." I argue that what happened in and around Srebrenica in July 1995 was not just a "local genocide" but in fact the culmination of a planned and widespread genocidal process begun in the spring of 1992 and meant to exterminate Bosnian Muslims throughout the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The second, empirical part of this book—chapters 4 and 5—is presented in accordance with a micro-case-study approach. Chapter 4 follows the genocidal process in seven eastern Bosnian municipalities: Zvornik, Vlasenica, Bratunac, Rogatica, Foča, Višegrad, and Srebrenica. In each of these cities, and the villages that surround them, the genocide followed a standardized pattern of implementation. Each microanalysis highlights some specific aspects that correspond with other cases of genocide in world history.

Chapter 5 deals with denial, known as the "eighth stage of genocide," and the way the Serb population in Eastern Bosnia justified mass crimes committed against the Bosniak population. Some Serbs were active participants, many others were passive bystanders, and only a small minority offered their neighbors help and protection by taking up the honorable role of saviors. The topic of denial is an especially important one in contemporary Bosnian society, because the narrative of the war remains contested and the question of genocide has been left unresolved. This is the key obstacle in a reconciliation process that has not moved forward in the twenty years since the war.

The empirical research presented in chapters 4 and 5 is set amid the context of the dissolution of Yugoslavia and the chronology of major events that led to genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Many observers and citizens of Yugoslavia were surprised at the outburst of Serbian nationalism that appeared in 1987 after Slobodan Milošević rose to power. Yet a deeper analysis shows that nationalist tensions within the Communist Party were present during Tito's rule as well, as discussed in chapter 2. Since it is crucial to understand the causes of the dissolution of Yugoslavia in order to analyze genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the second chapter also discusses how propaganda played an important part in the final disintegration of the country, and especially in the process of dehumanizing non-Serbs. This part of the book is also informed by my personal knowledge of propaganda and firsthand experience with how it worked in practice. As a journalist, I observed profound changes in domestic media from the late 1980s through the wars in the former Yugoslavia.

In the analysis of propaganda, it is impossible to single out the Bosnian case, since the history of the former Yugoslavia is so interwoven between different republics and regions, and because events in one had effects on the others. This said, it is important not to underestimate the central role Serbia had in creating and dominating nationalistic discourse. Therefore, in seeking to understand the effectiveness of this propaganda it is necessary to have deeper insight into the Kosovo myth—inspired by the Battle of Kosovo, against invading Ottoman forces in 1389—and the special place it holds in both Serbian culture and the national Serbian consciousness. The continuity of the Greater Serbia ideal, a concept which offers no place for the "other"—not even at the end of the twentieth century—is difficult to appreciate without knowledge of Kosovo mythology and the way it was manipulated by the Milošević propaganda machine.

With the help of documents from archives in The Hague as well as interviews with witnesses, I have analyzed more recent history as well, and I argue that the Serb plan was to wipe out the population of Bosnian Muslims from the entire territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Analysis offered in chapter 3 relies largely on evidence from the Tribunal archive—especially documents illustrating how Serbia established united command and control of all military, police, and paramilitary forces in its own territory and in territories it occupied in the neighboring republics of Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. The purpose of employing both macro- and micro-level analysis is to illustrate that Serbian state bureaucracy not only had a general plan to create a Greater Serbia but also engaged in hands-on planning, control, and organization of the genocide committed in its name. Although a very similar "scorched earth" and "civilian extermination" pattern was implemented in northwestern Bosnia, municipalities in eastern Bosnia are especially illustrative of the direct involvement and control that Belgrade had over the genocidal process. The Drina River is the natural border between Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia, and one of the main strategic goals of the aggression was to erase that border by exterminating the non-Serb population from towns and villages in the vicinity of the river. The main task of propaganda was to convince the international community that uncontrolled violence was occurring and that all parties to the war were equally responsible. And for three and a half years, this strategy was successful.

All genocides in history share features, but they also each have specific, unique elements. The uniqueness of the Bosnian case lies largely in the fact that it happened in Europe at the end of the twentieth century, in the same Europe that swore after the Holocaust that genocide would happen "never again." As Serb nationalists established concentration camps in Bosnia, Europe was still imbued with a sense of euphoria that followed the fall of the Berlin Wall. An acceleration of human rights rhetoric and the idea that the world was witnessing an unprecedented spread of liberal values and an expansion of the "free world" was a powerful aphrodisiac. Bosnians were also caught up in this ecstasy, and when the bombing first started we had no doubt that the "free world" would come running to our rescue.

The phenomenon of media globalization also made the Bosnian genocide unique. The first video images of the Holocaust were not seen until after the liberation of Auschwitz. The Bosnian genocide, on the other hand, to paraphrase the words of Norman Cigar, was the first genocide that was televised as it took place. And yet, despite the images of atrocities that were broadcast daily in “live” feeds, and despite public statements made by Serb politicians about their genocidal intentions, it was as if a majority of media representatives—along with E.U. and U.N. observers in the field—could not believe (or did not know) what they were seeing.

And so, confronted by the passivity of the liberal world, Bosnians were faced with more questions to which they could not fathom the answers, including: Why don’t they intervene? Then, in the postwar period, these questions grew in depth and complexity. After World War II, the Allies made it impossible for German political elites—as well as for ordinary Germans—to deny the Holocaust; but the denial of genocide in Bosnia became a norm for Serb political and intellectual elites and for ordinary Serbs alike. Denial adopted different forms and shapes in the international arena as well. A significant number of academics took on the case of genocide denial with a special kind of zeal.

From 1997 through 2001, as a journalist who specialized in reporting from The Hague during Tribunal trials, I was often drawn into debates and conferences on the nature of the Bosnian war. Like-minded Bosnian and international colleagues and I were challenged regularly by a dominant postmodern interpretation of the 1992–1995 conflict that, since nothing is black and white, there were no clear victims and no clear aggressors; so, all sides committed crimes and Serbs cannot be blamed for genocide. This narrative is embedded in a malicious revision of history.

Denial was widespread in international intellectual and political discourse, yet there was also an influential network of journalists, academics, and activists who were persistent in battling it. But as evidence about Serbian genocidal intent mounted, it seemed as if those who denied it became ever more passionate as well. In a conversation with a respectable American genocide scholar in Sarajevo in 1997, I was arguing that Bosnian Muslims in the 1990s, like European Jews in the 1940s, stood in the way of the creation of a racially “pure” state because they were seen as unwilling to assimilate and had no “backup country” to be deported to, and were thus targeted for extermination. When I commented that the term “ethnic cleansing” contributes to genocide denial, I noticed my conversation partner bristle. Still, his next question stunned me; he asked: “Can you explain to me why it is so, so important to you to call it genocide?” In a state of genuine surprise, I returned the question to him: “Can you first explain to me why it is so important to you to prove that the Bosnian case is not genocide?”

Conversations like this one further inspired me to write this book. In many academic discussions, it has seemed as though I have been forced to explain what I feel should be so obvious to everybody. Apparently it is not. Thus, part of this book is dedicated to the roots of the complex denial strategies employed by international academia, political decision makers, and the legal community.

The past, as American writer Greil Marcus remarked, “is another country,” uninhabitable, except in human memory.[4] But denial is different—it lives and breathes in the present (as do its architects). The denial that exists today in (and about) Bosnia and Herzegovina casts a shadow not only over its past but over its future too.

This page intentionally left blank

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The list of people and institutions that made this book possible is long, and I cannot mention them all. I am thankful for the grants from Fulbright, Soros, Širbegović, and the Ministry of Culture of Sarajevo Canton.

Testimonies of hundreds of genocide witnesses I interviewed over the past years were a constant motivator. Some of these witnesses are mentioned in this book by name, but many others are not. Yet all of their stories were decisive in shaping the book. Here I am especially grateful to Sabra Kolenović, Bakira Hasečić, Kada Hotić, Mesud Omerović, Izet Redžić, and many others who shared their traumatic experiences with me.

A network of colleagues and friends has also helped me in pursuing important information, documents, and visual materials. I mention only some of them: Ivo Banac, Sonja Biserko, Amila Buturović, Keith Doubt, Robert Donia, Asim Jusić, Adisa Mehić, Nena Tromp, Senad Pećanin, Jasmina Beširević-Regan, Kym Verco, and Jasmila Žbanić. During my research in the Slavic and East European Collection of the Yale University Library, Tanja Lorković's inspiring advice kept my spirits up.

I am grateful to my editor Bill Frucht for his efforts to improve the quality of the initial manuscript I submitted to Yale University Press. The three anonymous reviewers he chose strongly influenced the final shaping of this book. I also thank the other members of the Yale University Press editorial team: Jaya Chatterjee, Dan Heaton, and Otto Bohlmann.

Muradija and Osman Bećirević, my parents and teachers, were sources of constant encouragement for this book and have been throughout my career. And my sister, Majda Halilović, never gets tired of listening, reading, and offering advice on style and methodology.

But the person for whom I am most thankful of all is Kimberly Storr. She is a brilliant language editor, and much more than that. She relentlessly researched references, documents, and online sources, making sure all of them were up to date.

Genocide on the Drina River

This page intentionally left blank

1

THE FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS

THE LEGACY OF RAPHAEL LEMKIN

According to the U.N. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, which was adopted on December 9, 1948, and came into force on January 12, 1951, genocide is defined as: “Any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such: (a) Killing members of the group; (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.” Article III lists punishable acts as: “(a) genocide, (b) conspiracy to commit genocide, (c) direct and public incitement to commit genocide, (d) attempt to commit genocide, (e) complicity in genocide.”[1]

In 1943, five years prior to the adoption of the Convention, in an attempt to precisely describe the horrors committed by Nazis against Jews in Europe, Winston Churchill lamented, “As their army advances, whole districts are being exterminated. We are in the presence of a crime without a name.”[2] Raphael Lemkin, a Polish jurist of Jewish descent, moved by the agony of Jews and the world’s inability to find an adequate name for such mass suffering, took it upon himself to come up with one. After hearing the British leader’s speech, he concluded that politicians might try to stop crimes against Jews “if [they] could capture the crime in a word that connoted something truly unique and evil.”[3] Lemkin’s interest in the “crime without a name,” however, dated back to before the extermination of Jews by Germany. Spurred by mass crimes against Armenians, Lemkin presented his colleagues at the Fifth International Conference for the Unification of Penal Law, held in Madrid in 1933, with a draft of an international law that would forbid governments to destroy ethnic, national, and religious groups. He labeled this practice "barbarity" and defined "vandalism" as the destruction of "works of art and culture."[4] Lemkin's proposal was read in his absence and was rejected. Eventually, Lemkin offered his definition of genocide in a book he published in 1944:

> Generally speaking, genocide does not necessarily mean the immediate destruction of a nation, except when accomplished by mass killings of all members of a nation. It is intended rather to signify a coordinated plan of different actions aiming at the destruction of essential foundations of the life of national groups, with the aim of annihilating the groups themselves. The objectives of such a plan would be disintegration of the political and social institutions, of culture, language, national feelings, religion, and the economic existence of national groups, and the destruction of the personal security, liberty, health, dignity, and even the lives of the individuals belonging to such groups. Genocide is directed against the national group as an entity, and the actions involved are directed against individuals, not in their individual capacity, but as members of the national group.[5]

Three years later, Lemkin expanded this definition, adding that the crime of genocide includes not only deprivation of life but also the prevention of life (abortions, sterilizations) and schemes considerably endangering life and health (death caused by artificial infections, labor camps meant to literally exhaust detainees, the deliberate separation of families for depopulation purposes, and so forth).[6] It is obvious that the works of Raphael Lemkin significantly impacted the content of the U.N. Convention on Genocide as well as its Charter of the International Military Tribunal, commonly known as the London Agreement. The Charter, adopted on August 8, 1945, in London, provided precise instructions and a legal basis for the Nuremberg trials. Three foundational crimes were specified: crimes against peace (wars of aggression), violation of rules of war (war crimes), and crimes against humanity (extermination and torture of civilians based on racial, religious, and political grounds).[7]

Lemkin's life and pioneering work has made him a legend in genocide studies, and he is an unavoidable reference in any genocide research. Beyond his focus on the genocide committed against Jews and Armenians, Lemkin was also knowledgeable about crimes and genocide committed during the colonial period against indigenous people. Still, his broad definition of what constitutes genocide narrowed somewhat over time, as he was forced to compromise a number of his earlier ideals while actively lobbying for adoption of the Convention at the United Nations.

In the first draft of the U.N. Convention, Lemkin aimed to incriminate both cultural genocide and linguicide. His argument was, "First they burn books, then they start burning bodies."[8] However, since the U.N. Legal Committee had failed to endorse the incrimination of cultural genocide, and the U.N. General Assembly was approaching the deadline for adopting the Convention, Lemkin sacrificed this point to ensure adoption of the larger document.[9] In initial discussions at the United Nations it was suggested that political groups, too, should be protected by the Convention. However, the Soviet delegation, together with the Communist countries of Eastern Europe and some in Latin America, opposed the inclusion of political groups on the list of those protected by the Convention, claiming it would make the suppression of internal, armed uprisings impossible. Those opposed to inclusion of these groups further asserted that political groups are often neither cohesive nor detectable. After realizing how divided opinions on this issue were, even Lemkin, in order not to endanger the adoption of the Convention, lobbied against protection of political groups.[10]

Samantha Power presents the basic arguments of American critics of the Convention, who have pointed to the fact that, according to the Convention, a state can be held responsible for genocide if it kills even five people for reasons related to their religious, racial, or ethnic affiliation. On the other hand, Power notes, "the exclusion of political groups from the convention made it much harder in the late 1970s to demonstrate that the Khmer Rouge were committing genocide in Cambodia when they set out to wipe out whole classes of alleged 'political enemies.'"[11] It is also worth noting that the United States, though its delegation actively participated in drafting the Convention, did not ratify it until 1986. And then its ratification included a special "Sovereignty Package," which includes what is known as a constitutional reservation that avows the superiority of the U.S. Constitution over the Convention, essentially reserving the right of the United States to decide whether, when, and how the Convention on Genocide can be applied to American actions.[12]

Adoption of the Convention meant the "crime without a name" not only got a name but was also potentially punishable. However, except for a handful of individual cases at national courts in Europe, which processed a number of the crimes committed during the Second World War, the Convention was not used in addressing mass atrocities that could have qualified as genocide. The Cold War was a crucial factor in the "inaction" of the Convention. In the atmosphere that accompanied this bipolar paradigm, it was impossible to establish an international criminal court at which the Convention could be applied. It was only after the establishment of the International Criminal Tribunals for

Yugoslavia and Rwanda in the 1990s that international criminal law established precedents for punishing the crime of genocide and applied the Convention in practice.

THE HOLOCAUST AND COMPARATIVE GENOCIDE RESEARCH

While the extermination of Jews in Europe during the Holocaust motivated Raphael Lemkin to define the worst crime against humanity so that politicians would try to prevent it, there are others who have accepted part of this legacy but have made a departure from Lemkin's inclusive approach in defining genocide and from the obligation of the international community to stop it. Stephen T. Katz represents the scholarly movement which insists that the Holocaust is the only true genocide in history. Despite conducting an extensive comparative historical analysis, Katz has not given up on a very high, almost unreachable standard for defining genocidal crimes.[13] Orientalist Bernard Lewis also seems to support the opinion that no case of mass murder except the Holocaust can be labeled as genocide. Lewis has, by this logic, denied the genocide against Armenians. He told the French newspaper *Le Monde* that the killing of 1.5 million Armenians was a "brutal consequence of war," and that it would be "absurd to call it genocide." This statement brought Lewis before a French court, indicted for denial of genocide, and resulted in his paying a symbolic fine of one franc.[14] Increasingly, though, theoreticians have been deconstructing this thesis, and crimes committed in the Ottoman Empire against Armenians are widely recognized as genocide in scholarly literature.[15]

Debate between scholars who advocate for exclusivity of the Holocaust and those who argue that other cases of mass violence also fit the definition of genocide has been highly polemical. According to Martin Shaw, "In this debate, recognition of other cases—historical like Armenia, and contemporary, such as Rwanda—often depends on establishing a connection to the Holocaust."[16] Scholars who consider the establishment of the Holocaust as the single genocide in history as counterproductive for the prevention of future conflicts that may end in genocide have been gaining in prominence over the years. Their credibility has been supported by extensive empirical comparative research and sound arguments. The work of these scholars attests to how essential the comparative method is in genocide research; the variety of examples of genocide throughout history offers scholars a chance to identify common characteristics, which can help lead to the detection of genocide while in its preparation phases, prior to its perpetration. There are issues about which these more inclusive researchers also disagree, but they share many more points of consensus that are developing theoretical concepts which distinguish genocide from other mass and systematic state crimes.

Israel Charny is among those who argue for a significantly more inclusive definition of genocide. He asserts that genocide is a generic term and that all known mass murders of people should be defined as genocide. Hence, he defines genocide as "mass killing of substantial numbers of human beings, when not in the course of military actions against the military forces of an avowed enemy, under conditions of the essential defenselessness of the victim."[17] In fact, Charny's definition excludes the idea of "intent to annihilate a nation" and sets high standards for respecting human rights even in so-called just or rightful wars, in other words, humanitarian interventions, defensive wars, and the like. According to Charny, any "collateral damage"—as civilian casualties of war are often labeled in modern warfare parlance—may be considered genocide, and the result of genocidal acts.

Frank Chalk and Kurt Jonassohn, on the other hand, argue that it is inappropriate to compare the intent of Turks to annihilate Armenians or of Germans to exterminate Jews with American military interventions, because "the USA never intended to destroy the Germans, Japanese and Vietnamese as a group, while leaders of Turkey and Nazi Germany did intend to annihilate Armenians and Jews."[18] Leo Kuper, who is considered after Lemkin to be one of the most important contributors to genocide theory, is more aligned with Charny's approach, as he seems to believe that genocide is not reserved for totalitarian regimes, and that history has shown how pluralistic societies are not immune to genocide either. In his 1981 monograph *Genocide: Its Political Use in the Twentieth Century*, Kuper divides genocide into three types, according to the motives of perpetrators:

1) Genocide designed for the elimination of ethnic or religious differences,
2) Genocide with intent to inspire terror among colonial subjects, and
3) Genocide committed to achieve ideological aims.[19]

The problem with these kinds of genocide typologies is that it is difficult to strictly apply them to reality, since perpetrators never have only one motive. The genocide in Rwanda, for example, was motivated by ethnic differences, but—if we take into account the country's longtime colonial status and the interests of some very powerful countries—it was, in a way, the consequence of colonization. In order to mobilize a population for any genocide, a very extremist ideology must have influence. Therefore, according to Kuper's typology, the case of the last Rwandan genocide could fall under each of his three types.

In his book published in 1985, *The Prevention of Genocide*, Kuper shifted his attention to evaluating the potential of the international community, NGOs that deal with human rights, and other legal bodies to prevent genocide.[20] Nevertheless, his work is characterized by a very wide interpretation of the term. Kuper treats the nuclear attack against Japan, the American military intervention in Vietnam, and the bombing of Dresden as genocide.[21]

Apart from the sociological analysis of different cases, authors who advocate a comparative and more inclusive approach have also made attempts to develop their own definitions of genocide, in response to a lack of precision in the definition given in the U.N. Convention. Helen Fein's, though worded differently, echoes the spirit of the Convention: "Genocide is sustained purposeful action by a perpetrator to physically destroy a collectivity directly or through interdiction of the biological and social reproduction of group members, sustained regardless of the surrender or lack of threat offered by the victim."[22] According to Daniel Chirot and Clark McCauley, "A genocidal mass murder is politically motivated violence that directly or indirectly kills a substantial portion of a targeted population, combatants and noncombatants alike, regardless of their age and gender."[23] The Convention's definition of genocide ultimately seems too limited for historians and sociologists alike, and one of their most frequent objections, reflected in Chirot and McCauley's definition, is the fact that political groups are excluded from it.

For the sake of analysis, however, as well as for the sake of genocide prevention, even those who recognize faults in the U.N. Convention generally accept it, because political controversies of the sort that surrounded the initial drafting of the Convention and then its ratification are even more insidious in the current international environment. Amid the circumstances and power balance within the United Nations, one cannot hope that a better, legally binding definition will be developed in the near future.[24] Along these lines, Kuper has distinguished between his moral stance that genocide be understood very broadly and his academic recommendation that, for functional reasons, the international community adhere to the definition of genocide as stated in the U.N. Convention.

> I shall follow the definition of genocide given in the [U.N.] Convention. This is not to say that I agree with the definition. On the contrary, I believe a major omission to be in the exclusion of political groups from the list of groups protected. In the contemporary world, political differences are at the very least as significant a basis for massacre and annihilation as racial, national, ethnic or religious differences. Then too, the genocides against racial, national, ethnic or religious groups are generally a consequence of, or

> intimately related to, political conflict. However, I do not think it helpful to create new definitions of genocide, when there is an internationally recognized definition and a Genocide Convention which might become the basis for some effective action, however limited the underlying conception. But since it would vitiate the analysis to exclude political groups, I shall refer freely . . . to liquidating or exterminatory actions against them.[25]

Criminologists, historians, and sociologists generally agree that genocide comes in various forms, that its goals might differ, and that various strategies and tactics are applied in its perpetration.[26] Obviously, a completely harmonized theoretical framework for the analysis of genocide has not yet been established. In reviewing the work of those scholars who favor the comparative approach, however, some features common to all genocides become obvious. Therefore, in the analysis of genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina from 1992 to 1995, those commonly distinguishing features that might facilitate the detection both of genocidal intent and of the process of preparation for genocide will be reviewed. An insistence on outlining such characteristics is a question of effective prevention and therefore surpasses mere theoretical discussion.

Wars in the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda in the 1990s and the establishment of ad hoc international criminal tribunals to prosecute crimes against humanity and genocide have inspired many new authors to focus on this area of research. Introduction of the term “ethnic cleansing” and complicated legal standards in proving “genocidal intent” have confused the concept of genocide. Thus, referring back to the work of key authors in the field—especially those who followed in the footsteps of Raphael Lemkin—can be useful for clarifying the features that distinguish genocide from other forms of mass crimes.

THE STATE APPARATUS, IDEOLOGY, AND A GENOCIDAL PLAN

Genocide is increasingly being connected to empire building and state formation. While a research emphasis on atrocities committed under Nazi Germany existed for almost four decades after the Second World War, there has recently been a growing interest among scholars in the genocidal crimes committed during the period of colonialism. For, as Kuper remarked about genocide, “The word is new, the concept is ancient.”[27]

This new debate over official interpretations of violence committed against indigenous people has been especially adversarial in Australia, with an increasing number of researchers demanding that those crimes be called genocide. In his recent book, Ben Kiernan presents the Australian treatment of Aboriginal people during the first century of colonization there as a case of genocide.[28] Dirk Moses and Mark Levene similarly frame not only the Australian case but also other mass crimes committed during periods of imperialism and colonialism.[29] In the same way, historian Benjamin Madley argues that the resistance of indigenous populations to exploitation often led to colonial genocides against them.[30] Adam Jones concludes that "most of this colonial expansion was capitalist or proto-capitalist in nature, certainly with regard to the most destructive institutions imposed on native peoples."[31]

One key similarity among the views of genocide scholars is that they all emphasize the role of the state. After all, there is no accidental or spontaneous genocide. Irving Louis Horowitz stresses that genocide cannot be a sporadic or random event and must be "conducted with the approval of, if not direct intervention by, the state apparatus."[32] The systematic nature of genocide, which clearly involves serious and complex planning, has led to his conclusion that it is "a structural and systematic destruction of innocent people by a state bureaucratic apparatus."[33]

Chalk and Jonassohn have also emphasized the role of the state and of organized mass killing in their definition of genocide. According to them, genocide can be defined as "a form of one-sided mass killing in which a state or other authority intends to destroy a group, as that group and membership in it are defined by the perpetrator."[34] Chalk and Jonassohn's definition makes a departure from Horowitz's clear reference to a "bureaucratic state apparatus"; beyond the state, they introduce "other authority" into their definition. Similarly, Jack Nusan Porter, in his definition, mentions that genocide is committed by a "government or its agents," and he stresses that genocide involves three major components: "ideology, technology, and bureaucracy/organization."[35]

Helen Fein also suggests that, "given the long-term record of people killing at the call of tribal and national leaders," we should "refocus on what is taken for granted—the right of the state to authorize killing."[36] Fein says that the role of states which act as (active) bystanders is a crucial factor in the increasing incidence of genocide in the world. "Most states committing genocide are dependent on other states for recognition, aid and alliance. Genocide depends on toleration of bystander states to succeed. It is repeated by states so often because it succeeds. It succeeds because the great powers either practice it, or arm or tolerate the perpetrators."[37]

Some recent works have highlighted the role of non-state actors in the commission of mass crimes. Christian Gerlach suggests taking a wider approach to studying mass violence, by looking at what he calls "extremely violent societies." According to Gerlach, "by focusing more widely than just on government intentions, the extremely violent societies approach enables us to study far more actors and to take all of their intentions into account, including social and political groups, officials from various ministries, agencies, etc."[38] He suggests that researchers should concentrate more on the agendas of non-state actors who have significant influence on increasing levels of participatory violence. Michael Mann, another author who avoids using the term "genocide" for any mass crime but the Holocaust, also emphasizes the role of non-state actors, especially paramilitary forces, in carrying out mass crimes. Mann is ambivalent regarding the role of the state in planning ethnic cleansing. While he claims "it is rare to find evil geniuses plotting mass murder from the very beginning," he admits that "ethnic cleansings are in their most murderous phases usually directed by states, and this requires some state coherence and capacity."[39]

Despite some variations, genocide scholars highlight the role of the state in the planning, organization, and execution of genocide. If there is a continuity of attacks against members of a group, and those crimes go unpunished by state authorities who turn a blind eye to them, it becomes obvious that the state endorses and supports those genocidal actions, though it would not recognize this publicly. Yet, in order to mobilize the masses, a state apparatus needs a justifying political ideology. Aggressive ideology is one of the essential prerequisites for genocide. When comparing genocidal societies to others, Horowitz points to an intense nationalism as the key motivator used by a state to gain widespread approval for genocide. He says that nationalism "instills not only a sense of difference between those who belong and those who do not, but also the inhumanity of those who do not belong, and thereby the rights of the social order to purge itself of alien influence."[40]

Nationalistic ideology serves as a motivator for social crisis and abets the creation of a genocidal plan. A state apparatus uses nationalistic ideology as both a motivator and excuse for criminal actions. Analyzing use of the theory of a global Jewish conspiracy as a legitimating ideology for mass killings of Jews over some eight centuries, Norman Cohn says that beyond the participation of fanatics in these crimes were those whose aim was simply looting and killing. When we look at the modern era, Cohn identifies opportunists who have seen genocide as an opportunity to promote their own self-interest and gain profit. Still, Cohn claims that a justifying ideology is vital even for ordinary criminals with materialistic motives. "At least, when operating collectively, they need an ideology to legitimate their behavior, for without it they would have to see themselves and one another as what they really are—common thieves and murderers. And that apparently is something which even they cannot bear."[41]

State authorities create genocidal plans carefully and clandestinely. To serve the goal of keeping their active involvement covert, genocide is presented as uncontrolled violence, generally blamed on non-state actors. Ton Zwaan argues that genocide cannot be an isolated event or a single act; "it is more adequately conceptualized as a process in space and time: an interconnected series of many different acts by a considerable number of interdependent people, acting individually and in organized, collective forms."[42]

Genocide does not take place in stable societies, however. It requires crisis conditions, a loss of values, and a totalitarian leader. Fein notes that in such a state of crisis, and in a society where values have been shaken, there "emerges a party or group to enact this fantasy on earth usually led by a charismatic leader. The group and myth gives meaning to members' lives, ventilates and displaces their passion and legitimates ruthlessness. The myth becomes a warrant for genocide."[43]

According to Roger Smith, genocide requires a state of mind that lends itself to total absorption in a group, as well as "subordination to a leader, and ruthless adherence to its sense of cosmic mission, which becomes a license to destroy men, women, and children with a good conscience, free from guilt." Analyzing Cohn, Smith says he argues that "apocalyptic movements appear only in times of mass disorientation and social anxiety. It is not hardship as such that leads people into the quest for total salvation, but rather the collapse of the normative order, the fact that society no longer seems to make any sense."[44]

DEHUMANIZATION OF VICTIMS AND MASS PARTICIPATION BY PERPETRATORS

While *genocidaires* make their plans with much rationality—carving maps up into racially or ethnically uniform states in which there is no place for other, non-assimilable races and people—a psychological motivation is necessary to spur the masses to participate in the extermination of those "others," or at least to stick their heads in the sand, so to speak, and accept without resistance the genocidal actions of the state.[45] Thus, the main task of the state in implementing such a malicious and complicated plan is to dehumanize the victim group and portray it as unworthy of sharing precious resources with the dominant group.

Victims such as the Jews in Nazi Germany "could be magnified as threats because they were defined by ideology, propaganda, and tradition as outside the universe of obligation—as enemies and unassimilable aliens."[46] Placing a group "outside the universe of obligation" is not possible without a central myth that portrays the targeted group in a negative light. Alex Alvarez writes that the Tutsi minority in Rwanda "had been perceived as a privileged class in Rwandan society, and the violence of the genocide was fueled in part by the resentment many within the Hutu majority felt for their Tutsi neighbors."[47] Alvarez also points out that the “largely rural Bosnian Serb community had often been somewhat bitter towards the Bosnian Muslims who, in addition to being seen as subscribing to an alien faith were also perceived to be more cosmopolitan, wealthier, and urban.”[48]

Still, the question many authors struggle in answering is: What motivates ordinary people to participate in genocide?

Two books, with opposing arguments, are fundamental to the literature on genocide; they focus on revealing the causes of the mass involvement of Germans in the genocide against Jews. *Hitler’s Willing Executioners* by Daniel Goldhagen and *Ordinary Men* by Christopher Browning both explore the causes of the Holocaust at the executor level—in other words, the authors are interested in the reasons for such large-scale participation by ordinary Germans in the genocide.[49] Goldhagen argues that German anti-Semitic attitudes toward Jews were the central causal agent of the Holocaust. In his view, anti-Semitism is also the reason numerous ordinary Germans were enthusiastic executors of crimes against Jews; anti-Semitism, Goldhagen argues, was a driving force that turned ordinary middle-class family men into mass killers. He believes an anti-Semitism that had been smoldering for decades intensified after Hitler’s rise to power, and that Germans in fact practically and readily received Hitler and his plan to annihilate Jews because their deeply ingrained anti-Semitic attitudes made them psychologically open to it. Thus the title of his book literally reflects the core of his argument.[50]

Christopher Browning, on the other hand, found that, when accompanied by ideological indoctrination, the transformation of family men into mass murderers results from peer group pressure, fear of isolation, and macho values (fear of being perceived as weak or cowardly); and, for some, careerism also plays a role. Browning has invested significant effort toward understanding the developmental process that leads ordinary men down such a path. His book is a warning that reminds us over and over again of the dangers of the banality of evil, and of the capacity of the circumstances and pressures of warfare and racism to lead to lethal and large-scale transformations of personality.[51]

Both Goldhagen and Browning present moving testimony on the origins of human evil. Browning’s interpretation is more acceptable to historians and sociologists because of its moderate functionalist argumentation, which, in a way, offers deeper understanding of the evil that develops within “ordinary people” and provides an acceptable explanation—tossing responsibility off to military command, propaganda, wartime pressures, social influences, and numerous other psychological mechanisms. Goldhagen’s arguments, however, though rejected as biased by a great number of authors, also deserve serious and in-depth analysis. Goldhagen demonstrates the magnitude of the risk of longtime indoctrination—in the form of anti-Semitism or any other political ideology based in hatred—and points to the consequences that can emerge from the dehumanization of "others."

Dehumanization, as shown repeatedly in this book, is an essential condition for genocide; the higher the level of dehumanization, the more enthusiastic the perpetrators of genocide become. In this respect, although uneasy and direct in its delivery, Goldhagen's book is very instructive, because it insists on the accountability of the people in whose name a state commits genocide.[52]

While Browning did emphasize that a "deluge of racist and anti-Semitic propaganda" played a key role in the genocide against Jews, he was criticized by Goldhagen for downplaying its importance. Yet Browning's analysis is much more complex than Goldhagen's and gave importance to other factors in the process of ordinary people's transformation into killers. To support his thesis, Browning gave much prominence to the work of the Yale scholar Stanley Milgram, who conducted an experiment in the early 1960s that measured the willingness of subjects to obey the orders of an authority figure even if it meant inflicting pain on other human beings. Study participants—ordinary people without any history of violence—were instructed that they could give electric shocks to people on the other side of a wall as a punishment for every wrong answer they gave, if an authority figure told them they could. Only one-third of study participants refused to inflict pain on another person.[53]

Milgram suggested that an explanation for the behavior of study participants could be found in the theories of "conformism" and the "agentic state." Conformism describes the behavior of a subject who sees himself or herself as being neither capable nor expert enough to make decisions, especially in a crisis, and therefore leaves decision making to a group and its hierarchy. An agentic state—the alternative to an autonomous state, in which people make decisions based on their own belief system—is, in essence, a diffusion of responsibility to authorities of a higher rank, so that persons no longer self-monitor their behavior and come to view themselves as instruments for carrying out the orders of others.[54] According to Milgram, a shift to the agentic state occurs when a legitimate source of social control articulates a "justifying ideology." He pointed to such institutions as the church, the government, and schools as sources of this ideology and noted that "ideological justification is vital in obtaining *willing* obedience, for it permits [a] person to see his behavior as serving a desirable end."[55]

A similar experiment was conducted at Stanford University in 1971. Psychologist Philip Zimbardo built an experimental prison to test the behavior of student volunteers who were assigned the roles of prison guards and prisoners. In very little time, both "guards" and "prisoners" had adapted to the expectations of their environment. As many as one-third of the student "guards" became increasingly sadistic to such a degree that the experiment was canceled to avoid situations that could have resulted in dangerous psychological consequences for study participants.[56]

These two experiments demonstrate that, besides long-term indoctrination in nationalist and racist propaganda, powerful social settings can also influence changes in human behavior and personality. As Zimbardo reflected, more than two decades after his experiment, "Good people can be induced, seduced, and initiated into behaving in evil ways. They can also be led to act in irrational, stupid, self-destructive, antisocial, and mindless ways when they are immersed in 'total situations' that impact human nature in ways that challenge our sense of the stability and consistency of individual personality, of character, of morality. . . . The SPE [Stanford Prison Experiment] is a clarion call to abandon simplistic notions of the Good Self dominating Bad Situations. We are best to avoid, prevent, challenge, and change such negative situational forces only by recognizing their potential power to 'infect us,' as it has others who were similarly situated."[57]

When the results of Milgram's and Zimbardo's experiments were released, the American public was shocked. The horrors of the Holocaust and the behavior of prison guards in Nazi concentration camps had always been portrayed as something that happened "over there," and as something alien to Western liberal traditions. But the Stanford prison experiment especially showed that Americans were not immune to becoming monsters, too, when submerged in "total situations." Zimbardo's experiment received a new wave of public attention during the trials of U.S. soldiers accused of abuses at Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq. In his testimony in the capacity of an expert witness at the trials, Zimbardo argued that "the authoritarian environment of the prison (whether real or experimental) produced aberrant and abusive behavior by otherwise ordinary individuals."[58]

Both of these experiments work against the theory that there exist "genocidal people." Instead, in "total situations," people exposed to aggressive propaganda that dehumanizes the victim group do adhere to that ideology, often very obediently. Then again, participants in the Milgram and Zimbardo experiments were not exposed to genocidal propaganda and had no history of violence; yet a majority of them indicated a readiness to follow the orders of authorities to commit crimes. Obedience to authority and the willingness of people to accept criminal orders does point to an important, yet under-researched, aspect of human psychology in extreme situations. Why some people are perpetrators and some are saviors is addressed in depth in chapter 5, which deals with the psychological aspects of genocide denial.

PHASES OF GENOCIDE

In setting a framework for the analysis of genocide, the work of Gregory Stanton is very useful. In Stanton's opinion, genocide happens in eight phases. The first phase, classification, divides people into "us and them." In the second phase, symbolization, "they" are labeled with names or other symbols so that "they" can be distinguished. Through the process of dehumanization, which is the third phase, one group denies the humanity of the other. Members of the dehumanized group are equated with insects, animals, and other similar "subhuman" forms. Phase four, organization, implies that genocide is always organized, usually by the state. Then, in the polarization phase, extremists drive an even bigger wedge between the groups, the language of hate is intensified, and marriages or social interactions among different groups are forbidden. In the sixth phase, preparation, victims are identified and separated out due to their identity with the dehumanized group. Extermination is the seventh phase; it starts soon after identification, growing quickly into the mass killing known as genocide. The eighth and final phase is the phase of denial. According to Stanton, this phase is among the surest indicators of future genocidal events.[59]

Analyzing the spectrum of definitions of genocide—which, depending on their author, focus on different components of the crime—Ton Zwaan notes that, over the years, the topic has been debated by politicians and diplomats, lawyers and jurists, historians and social scientists, various other intellectuals, and the public at large. As Zwaan sees it, the concept has sometimes broadened and sometimes narrowed, and with every new case of alleged genocide since 1945 the meaning of the concept has been reexamined. He believes that this diversity of views on the issue should be no cause for surprise; the general notion of genocide refers to a whole range of specific cases of alleged genocidal crimes in the real world, consisting of (partly) different and quite complex events and developments in different countries at different times, often difficult to understand and hard to explain. Zwaan asserts that genocide is the topic of so much academic research because it is indeed a far from neutral concept and is, in fact, highly loaded, in human and moral, political, and juridical significance. He adds that perpetrators at all levels of responsibility usually have a great interest in covering up their crimes and in keeping the genocide secret by denying it, while on the other hand, victims have a strong right to justice, and survivors a rightful claim to the acknowledgment of their fate and losses as well as an expectation of some form of redress.[60]

Denial as the eighth phase of genocide is also a sign of unresolved political realities that could set the stage for another conflict; thus, battling denial is beyond a psychological drama. The denial that exists today in Bosnia and Herzegovina is poisoning its future to such a degree that a significant number of international analysts have contemplated a recurrence of war in the region. Understanding genocide's causes, therefore, is mandated by more than the cries for justice by genocide survivors.

The theoretical concept offered in this book relies very much on the definition of genocide offered in the U.N. Convention on Genocide, as well as on Lemkin's early interpretation that genocide is not only about killing but about social and cultural destruction as well. And, as Martin Shaw stresses, genocide involves "batteries of coercive powers—legal, administrative, political, ideological and economic, as well as armed, violent and military. Defining genocide by killings misses the social aims that lie behind it."[61] Examining mass crimes committed in Bosnia and Herzegovina during the 1992–1995 war only through the lens of lives lost *misses the point* of why genocide is carried out. Identifying the only genocide in Bosnia as the one that took place in Srebrenica simply because the density of the killing was greatest there overlooks the *social aims* that the state of Serbia—by means of its Bosnian Serb agents and the military power of the Yugoslav Army—wanted to achieve through the war. Analysis of the case of genocide in Bosnia is impossible to view outside the context of Yugoslav history. Thus, the following chapter discusses the legal, administrative, political, ideological, and economic context of how a genocidal idea developed into a plan and then into action amid the dissolution of Yugoslavia.

2

THE DISSOLUTION OF YUGOSLAVIA AND THE PROPAGANDA OF DEHUMANIZATION

The notion of the dissolution of Yugoslavia entered public discourse upon Slobodan Milošević's rise to power in 1987. Yet the idea of it, at a slower pace, had been planted much earlier, by prior Serbian Communist leaders; and their groundwork gave Milošević a strong base of intranational mistrust upon which to build. Tito's death had opened up the space for national tensions to escalate when Yugoslav Communists, faced with a rising economic crisis, differing ideological views, and disagreements on the future structure of the state, began to differentiate along ethnic lines. This is not to say that national relations in Yugoslavia were ideal during Tito's rule. But Tito managed conflicting national interests within the Communist Party by combining a dictatorial ruling style with his "brotherhood and unity" doctrine, and—thanks to generous loans from the West—the promise of enviable living standards in comparison to other Eastern European countries. As representatives of the largest Yugoslav nation, Serbian Communists not only occupied the most prominent positions of power but also expressed their sense of greater ownership rights to the Yugoslav state, over other nationalities.[1] The concept of brotherhood and unity, meant to imply parity, actually promoted growing differences among the Yugoslav nations, as "some are more equal than the others" was often whispered among the disadvantaged.

Non-Slav (Albanian and Hungarian) minorities had paid their price after the Second World War, not least of all for having played an insufficient role in the Partisan struggle. The solution to the national question at that point was to give constitutional status to just five South Slavic constituent nations: Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Montenegrins, and Macedonians. This initial number of nations corresponded with five of the six republics, in which each of these nations made up a majority; but constituent rights did not stop at republic borders. For example, Croats formed a constituency in Vojvodina even though Hungarians outnumbered them there. Albanians were deprived of constituency rights despite the fact that they were the majority in Kosovo. Bosnia and Herzegovina was the only Yugoslav republic that did not have a dominant majority nation. Until 1971, Serbs and Croats were the majority nations in Bosnia, with Muslims finally joining them after gaining recognition as a sixth constituent nation.[2]

National tensions were present throughout Yugoslavia to various degrees, yet the province of Kosovo was always the most vulnerable flashpoint. Aleksandar Ranković, Tito's security chief, made special efforts to repress Albanians in Kosovo during the 1950s and 1960s. Similar campaigns, though less extensive, were launched against Muslims from the Serbian region of Sandžak and against Hungarians in Vojvodina, but Albanians were treated with particular harshness because of their uprising against the reimposition of Yugoslav rule at the end of World War II. The period from 1947 to 1966 is still popularly called "the Ranković era" in Kosovo. Dissatisfaction on the part of Kosovo's Albanians with the way they were treated in the Yugoslav Federation was used by neighboring Albania to fuel nationalism. And instead of developing a responsible national program to bring them into the federation, Tito entrusted Ranković's security forces to discipline the Albanian population.

While the Yugoslav constitution of 1946 formally recognized the autonomy of the province of Kosovo in the Republic of Serbia, and brotherhood and unity was the official policy there as well, the reality was that Albanians were faced daily with an atmosphere of terror. Under the guise of searches for illegal weapons, they were regularly exposed to repressive police measures that included the torture and killing of real and alleged political dissidents, popularly called irredentists. It was during this period that a significant number of Albanians from Kosovo and Muslims from Sandžak relocated to Turkey.[3]

Ranković was one of the three most influential politicians in Tito's circle, even supervising purges of allegedly pro-Stalin Communists after the split with Stalin in 1948. Divisions in the Yugoslav secret police apparatus, however, revealed the subtext of national tensions present during the 1950s and 1960s; for while Ranković managed to keep firm control over the secret police in Serbia, Montenegro, and Macedonia, he failed to do the same in Croatia, Slovenia, and Bosnia and Herzegovina. Further, Ranković was regarded as a pillar of the conservative forces that opposed reforms and democratization of the country.[4]

It took years for opponents of Ranković to unseat him, but their patience in gathering evidence against him paid off. Plus, Ranković's own arrogance worked in his opponents' favor. It was known that secret police under his control were spying on members of the top leadership, and there were even reports of his blackmailing them with details of their private lives. But Ranković went too far, allegedly intruding on Tito's privacy by bugging his sleeping quarters. In July 1966, Ranković was kicked out of the party and barred from all party and public functions. Despite a long and grave list of sins, including conspiracy against the regime and an abuse of secret police that resembled Stalin's, Yugoslav Communist justice in this case stopped short of criminal prosecution and trial. The official explanation was that Ranković had respectably earned merits in the development of Yugoslavia, and that the alleged conspiracy he planned with his associates did not have the chance to succeed.[5] A more logical explanation is that Ranković simply knew too much. The secret police had been under his control for some time, and had probably gathered enough evidence to compromise the majority of the Yugoslav leadership—including Tito himself. Thus, criminal prosecution and trial were out of the question.

Ranković maintained a low profile for the rest of his life, but his name became a symbol of repression against non-Serbs, especially Albanians. For the faction of Serbian Communists who were attempting to centralize Yugoslavia for the benefit of Serbs, Ranković was seen as a champion of imperiled Serbian national interests. He died in 1983, seventeen years after his dismissal, and his death curiously brought him back to the center of public attention. While he had promised to stay under the radar after falling from Tito's grace and even though his funeral was supposed to be a quiet affair—lacking the usual speeches and honors reserved for Communist dignitaries—admirers used his death to break his silence and pay their last respects in thunderous unison. Around one hundred thousand Serbs attended his funeral, chanting his nickname, "Leko, Leko." Presciently, Serbian nationalist hardliners in the Communist ranks had openly warned Tito in 1966 that the downfall of Ranković was an offense that the Serbian people would not forgive. Writer Dobrica Ćosić, who was to become a leading Greater Serbia ideologist, wrote a letter to Tito on June 28, warning him about a loss of popularity among the Serbs because they believed Ranković to be "the state symbol of Serbia."[6] The masses of people who attended his funeral demonstrated that Serbians indeed identified with his cause to centralize Yugoslavia by whatever means necessary, in order to achieve the supremacy of Serbs.[7]

In the period after the fall of Ranković, the influence of liberals in the Communist Party saw an upturn. Economic reforms meant to decrease federal influence on the economies of the republics were disappointing. Dissatisfaction with these reforms was most openly expressed in Croatia. One of the key drivers of the reforms was the notion that they would relax the centralization of funds, but the results seemed to be the reverse: Belgrade banks retained control of the majority of foreign loans.[8]

Liberalization of the cultural and media spheres combined with discontent related to economic reforms contributed to more open articulations of national self-awareness, especially in Croatia, where intellectuals assessed that their national identity was in danger. A language declaration signed in 1967 by 140 distinguished intellectuals, including the famous writer Miroslav Krleža, asked for equal status for the four languages in Yugoslavia: Slovenian, Croatian, Serbian, and Macedonian.[9] Croatian Communists, led by Savka Dabčević Kučar and Miko Tripalo, aligned their interests with the intellectual cultural movement and demanded more autonomy for Croatia through the party platform. This national revival, along with an economic crisis and the rise of unemployment, spiraled out of control in 1971, resulting in massive protests. Protesters expressed the overwhelming sentiment in Croatia at the time—opposition to domination by Serbs in Yugoslavia. As a result, the protests were a stage for strong anti-Serbian messages. Tito's assessment was that Croatian republic-level leaders did not decisively enough calm the protests. On December 1, 1971, he summoned them to his Karađorđevo retreat in Vojvodina and effectively removed them from office. Mass purges of liberals from the Croatian Communist Party and a series of arrests followed. One of those arrested was Franjo Tuđman, who would become the first president of the Republic of Croatia in 1991; and purges of liberals extended beyond Croatia to other republics as well.

At the end of the 1960s and the beginning of the 1970s, the political scene in Serbia was also less than harmonious. The forces of Serbian conservatives requesting further centralization versus liberals demanding more democratization and decentralization openly clashed in the federal party forums. Liberal leaders at the republic level advocated and implemented greater religious freedoms, tolerance toward national cultural activities, and the relaxation of media censorship. They advocated for economic reforms, and for a younger, more open-minded political movement that focused more on Serbia than on Yugoslavia. This latter point especially was interpreted by hardliners as a betrayal of Serbian national interests.[10] The liberal ambitions of the Communists in Serbia and Croatia during this period were a threat to Tito's firm hold on central power. Thus, after silencing Croatian liberals in 1971, he purged their counterparts in Serbia in 1972. To do so effectively, Tito needed the continued support of Communist hardliners, who came from the ranks of all Yugoslav republics and nations.[11]

Changes to the Yugoslav constitution from 1946 to 1974 were intended to work out a suitable federation model that could accommodate the sensitive national question and create balance between opposing forces as to the appropriate level of autonomy for republics and provinces. Functionally, the debate was really about how to decrease Serbian domination over other nations. This issue was not just a feature of the Communist era, it has been the key problem in South Slav relations since the first unification of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes after the First World War. As Banac has noted: “After the unification, the denial of the national individuality of each South Slavic nation, a position inherent in the precepts of unitaristic Yugoslavism, greatly facilitated the introduction of centralism.”[12] This integral unitarism, Banac further argues, became regarded as an implement of Serbian dominance and was therefore discredited; and the creation of a supranational Yugoslav identity was criticized along the same lines—if Serbs directed the development of such an identity, this meant practically that other nations would be forced to assimilate.[13] Tito was also tempted, especially during the 1950s, by the notion of a supra-Yugoslav identity, but he gave up on the idea at the beginning of 1960s because “he provoked tremendous opposition among the Communists of Slovenia, Croatia and so on, who saw this as an opening for the revival of Serbian hegemony.”[14]

Though Tito forcefully crushed the liberal wave at the beginning of the 1970s, he eventually accommodated a number of liberal demands in the design of the 1974 Yugoslav constitution. Changes to the constitution obviously aimed to ease the control of Serbs by allowing more autonomy for the republics. It also gave almost equal rights to the two provinces within Serbian territory, Kosovo and Vojvodina. Serbian nationalists saw this as a conspiracy aimed against the Serb people and against Yugoslavia. They especially blamed Edvard Kardelj, a Slovenian and the number two man in Communist Party ranks, who was against Yugoslav unitarism, for Tito having reversed his position. As Banac sees it, “Tito, who was a master of political balance, came under tremendous pressure in 1971 to stop the Croatian movement from accomplishing its political aims. . . . There was pressure from Serbia but also . . . in this case, tremendous pressures bearing down on Tito from the West” to maintain the status quo. However, he adds, “it is true that many of the ideas the Croatian leadership advanced in 1971 were incorporated into the 1974 Constitution.”[15]

YUGOSLAV MUSLIMS: RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL IDENTITY

Following World War II, the Muslim national question was among those hot-button issues that, together with attitudes toward decentralization of the country, served as the barometer of Serbian nationalism among Communist Party members.[16] Bosnian Muslims who had joined the Partisan struggle were encouraged by the Communists' choice to give Bosnia and Herzegovina a separate status after the war. But national identity was initially denied to Muslims, and ambitions to assimilate Muslims into the Serb, Croat, and Macedonian nations became apparent. In the first postwar census Muslims were given the option to choose to be Serbian-Muslim, Croatian-Muslim, or Macedonian-Muslim; or they could choose to list their nationality as undeclared. It was clear that the assimilation of Muslims would not go smoothly when a vast majority (808,921) chose to be listed as undeclared.[17] A second postwar census, undertaken in 1953, introduced a new option—"Yugoslav-nation undeclared"—and in Bosnia and Herzegovina a significant majority again chose this identification. This was further proof that Yugoslavia needed a sound solution to the Muslim national question.[18] The 1963 census introduced a category for Muslims in the ethnic sense, which significantly decreased the number of citizens who declared themselves Yugoslavs.[19] It was finally in the 1971 census that Muslims were treated on a par with other nations, without definitional confusion between the concepts "nation" and "ethnicity." The census showed that 39.5 percent of Bosnians and Herzegovinians identified as Muslim. With national recognition, Muslims in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Yugoslavia rose within the Communist ranks and, instead of following the lead of either their Serb or their Croat colleagues, started formulating independent policies. Yet the Muslim national identity continued to be disparaged.

The resistance of Serbian ideologists to recognition of nationhood for Muslims, or to the idea of a Bosniak or Bosnian nation, has two main sources. One is the belief that Bosnia and Herzegovina is Serb territory, key to the creation of a Greater Serbia; and the other is the notion that Slavic Muslims are "traitors" to the Serbian faith.

It can be argued that the modern-day Serbian nationalist agenda is ideologically rooted in a memo known as "Načertanije" (The Outline), which served as a framework for Serbian state policy and was written covertly in 1844 by Ilija Garašanin, Serbia's minister of the interior in the government of Prince Aleksandar Karađorđević.[20] This was among the first steps taken at an institutional level to shape a state founded on the Serbian ideal, along with detailing specific goals and instructions for the creation of a Greater Serbia. Inspired by growing nationalistic tendencies throughout Europe, Garašanin used the language of romantic nationalism to promote the territorial expansion of Serbia. The central idea of the Načertanije was the unification of Serbs living in the territories of the Ottoman Empire. According to the Načertanije, this new Serbian state would include Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Macedonia, Kosovo, and present-day northern Albania. The plan was considered the basic framework for assimilation of those living in targeted territories; people like Slavic Muslims, who, according to Serbian ideologists, lacked a national consciousness.[21]

Parallel to Serbia gaining independence from Ottoman rule in 1878, Bosnia came under Habsburg guardianship. And, as Cigar notes, "after gaining its autonomy and independence, Serbia continued to expand during the nineteenth century. In the territories acquired during this phase, the Muslims were forced to convert, leave or be liquidated."[22] During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, there were repeated attempts to bring the core ideas of Garašanin's plan to fruition, especially during the Balkan Wars, which were marked not only by territorial occupation but also by genocidal massacres of Albanians and Muslims from the Sandžak region by the Serbian and Montenegrin Army.

As World War I progressed, the idea of Slavic unity failed to attract Bosnian Muslims, who experienced a series of massacres against them and attacks on their properties by Bosnian Serbs. In November 1918, when Serb and Montenegrin soldiers entered Bosnia, "mayhem was the result."[23] With the collapse of the Habsburg Empire and the establishment of Yugoslavia, Serbs were united in one state. This Serb dominance made other groups uneasy, especially Muslims, who were seen as second-class citizens and were subject to constant harassment.[24]

In 1941, both Croatia and Serbia established fascist states in alliance with Germany. Serbian nationalists saw this as an opportunity to prepare for the creation of a Greater Serbia under the rule of Serbia's royal family. A document that refers to the ethnic cleansing of non-Serbs as the most important part of these plans is a memorandum entitled "Homogenous Serbia," published by Stevan Moljević on June 30, 1941. In it, Moljević outlined the idea of unifying Serbia within Yugoslavia or, in other words, creating a Serbian hegemony first in Yugoslavia and then in the Balkans. An adviser to Chetnik leader Draža Mihailović during World War II, Moljević envisaged the annexation of parts of neighboring states into a Serbian ethnic federal unit, through expulsion, emigration, and population exchange.[25]

A now infamous directive given by Mihailović on December 20, 1941, to Chetnik commanders Major Đorđe Lasić and Captain Pavle Đurišić facilitated the practical implementation of Moljević's proposals.[26] The first three points of the document clearly drafted plans to create a Greater Serbia, and the second called for that state to be "ethnically clean within the borders of Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Srem, Banat, and Bačka." The fourth point is explicitly genocidal, instructing "the cleansing of all national minorities and anti-state elements from state territory."[27] In accordance with the goals set forth in Mihailović's directive, Chetniks started to "cleanse" the Muslim-populated territory, particularly Muslims from Sandžak and eastern Bosnia, in the period between 1941 and 1945.[28] Research points to more than a hundred thousand Bosniak casualties during World War Two, making up more than 8 percent of the Bosniak population.[29]

While Muslims were seen by Serbian ideologists as an obstacle to the creation of a Greater Serbia, the other reason that Muslims were denied a distinct national identity is that they were regarded as "traitors" and "heretics" in Serbian national political and intellectual circles.[30] That Bosniaks are traitors to Orthodoxy is still the belief in extremist Serbian nationalist circles to this day, and was especially heavily exploited in propaganda at the end of the 1980s and during the 1990s. According to this interpretation, Bosniaks are unbelievers who, after Bosnia was conquered by the Ottomans in 1463, converted to Islam out of self-interest or capitulated under coercion.

The Islamization of Bosnia during Ottoman rule has been the subject of much disagreement among historians. One group espouses the view that the Patarins—Bosnian dual heretics who rejected the authority of both church and state—converted en masse to Islam simply because it was not forced upon them as Christianity had been. Mustafa Imamović looks at the case of Ban Kulin, the ruler of Bosnia who renounced the "Patarin heresy" and converted to Catholicism in April 1203. His research indicates that this conversion to Catholicism was forced: "Actually, the renouncing [of the heresy] proved to be nothing more than Kulin's tactical decision for self-defense in order to avoid the risk of a crusade."[31]

Another view, which discredits the Patarin heresy thesis, argues that pre-Ottoman Bosnia actually lacked church organization, religion, and religious belief. In John F. Fine's opinion, many Bosnians "were drawn to Islam in the century following the conquest because it was the vital, dynamic faith of the conquerors, not because they were predisposed to convert by adherence to any heretical doctrine."[32] Noel Malcolm asserts that during Ottoman conquests in Bosnia and Herzegovina the Bosnian and Catholic Churches competed for new members of their flocks, but neither had a major influence on the population: "Many villages must have been out of reach of both Franciscan monasteries and Bosnian Church *hižas* [monastic houses], at best seeing a friar or *krstjanin* [monk] on an annual visit. If we compare this state of affairs with conditions in Serbia or Bulgaria, where there was a single, strong and properly organized national church, we can see one major reason for the greater success of Islam in Bosnia."[33]

The depiction of Bosnian Muslims as traitors has also dominated discussions of their origins. In the first Yugoslavia, they were exposed to "a well-orchestrated harangue by hegemonist forces, who wished to depict the Muslims as anti-national and disruptive elements, synonymous with the Turks."[34] Confusion among Muslim intellectual and religious elites over whether they should be organized on a confessional or national basis further obscured a solution. Attitudes of the Yugoslav Muslim Organization—a political party that existed in the kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes—were divided between Serbian and Croatian nationalism.[35] Deprived of real political power and national institutions, Muslims clung to confessional organization in order to preserve their cultural and religious identities.

Denial of the statehood of Bosnia and Herzegovina has gone hand in hand with the denial of the national identity of Muslims. Present-day Bosnia and Herzegovina has its roots in the medieval kingdom of Bosnia, and there has been historical continuity in the advocacy of one Bosnian, or Bosniak, nation, regardless of confession.[36] This idea was especially nurtured by Bosnian Franciscans who viewed Bosniaks as Slavs, apart from any religious affiliations.[37] Austro-Hungarian Benjamin Kallay, the historian and common minister of finance from 1882 to 1903, was also an advocate of developing the cosmopolitan idea of Bosnian nationhood apart from confession.[38] But his "Bosniak project" was doomed to fail because there was no way Kallay could prevent the influence of Serbia and Croatia (and their churches) on Bosnia's Orthodox and Catholic populations to identify themselves, and therefore others, through the lens of religion.[39] Though often used interchangeably throughout history, the terms "Bosnian" and "Bosniak" have thus been differentiated over time, so that Bosniaks are now recognized as Slavs with a traditional adherence to Islam, and Bosnians as any inhabitants of Bosnia, regardless of ethnic origin or confessional identity.

Despite wide use of "Bosniak" to refer to all inhabitants of Bosnia under Ottoman rule—or perhaps because of this—the idea of a separate Bosniak nation was quashed in pre–World War Two Yugoslavia. After the war, it was commonly accepted that Muslims who lived in Bosnia identified themselves by their religion, and that a "majority of them [did] not have a national identification."[40] Still, the willingness of Muslims in the Communist ranks to promote the recognition of their nationality did not wane over time; and they worked patiently and quietly to get Tito on their side. Ranković and other Serbian hardliners were their main obstacles, and it was shortly after the downfall of Ranković that Tito reversed his opinion, declaring that the national identity of Muslims had to be recognized. Protest from Serbian nationalists followed in 1968. One of the most outspoken among them was Dobrica Ćosić, the same man who had warned Tito that Ranković's ruin would prove to be a lasting offense to the Serbian people.[41] Objections, however, came not only from Serbia. The Macedonian Communist Party also protested; its members considered Muslims who spoke Macedonian to be Macedonian, and the recognition of Muslims as a separate nation was a threat to the national balance of their republic.[42]

The Bosnian Communists—a multinational party—took the position that, despite objections from other republics, they would not allow a split along national lines within their own ranks. Under the leadership of Branko Mikulić, a Bosnian Croat, much investment was made in preserving the new national balance and reducing the suspicion and critiques of other republics about perceived negative effects of recognizing the new Muslim nation. Bosnian Communists swiftly reacted to any overt expressions of religiously motivated politics. They focused on fostering secular national sentiment among Bosnian Muslims, but at the same time stymied development of their separate national institutions. This was in part a response to the negative experience of the 1971 Croatian Spring, and in part due to the fear that by allowing the development of any Muslim nationalism, Serbian and Croatian nationalism would also be generated in Bosnia.[43]

In 1983, Alija Izetbegović—later the first president of Bosnia and Herzegovina, in 1991—was arrested and tried, along with twelve other Muslim intellectuals, for charges related to his manifesto, the *Islamic Declaration*. Inspired by Pan-Islamism, he called for the formation of a unified Islamic republic for Muslims around the world. Though he did not explicitly mention Bosnia and Herzegovina and clearly referred to the establishment of an Islamic federation composed of countries with majority Muslim population, the prosecution claimed that the manifesto was a blueprint for domestic Muslim nationalism. Izetbegović was charged with "enemy" activities, hostile propaganda, and attempting to create a Muslim state; after a show trial, he was given a fourteen-year sentence.[44] According to historians Noel Malcolm and Marko Hoare, Izetbegović's manifesto was not designed to inspire hatred toward non-Muslims, and his interpretation of Islam was moderate; and in his later work, *Islam between East and West*, he even supported the ideals of Western liberal democracy.[45] But the *Islamic Declaration* nonetheless offered Serbian nationalists a very useful platform from which to inspire fear among Serbs, warning them against the alleged danger of Islamic fundamentalism in Bosnia.

According to Cigar, at the time of Izetbegović's trial, Serbian nationalists were also dissidents at odds with the ruling Communist Party, and they had only limited influence among the Serbs. He relates Serbian actions to repress their own nationalists, noting that "as part of the Communist regime's desire for balance, several Serb nationalists were also arrested at the time of the Izetbegović trial and charged with being Chetniks."[46] However, despite this treatment of Serbs who openly advocated nationalism, in terms of the core national issues their views did not differ much from the more conservative and, after 1971, the most dominant faction among the Serbian Communists. While nationalists never stopped advocating for a Greater Serbia, Serbian Communists were trying to achieve the same end goal through further centralization, the denial of national rights to Muslims and Kosovar Albanians, and by fueling nationalism among Serbs living in Croatia.

THE ECONOMY AND NATIONAL TENSIONS

In the first years after World War Two, Yugoslavia had a mixed economy, combining both a planned socialist approach and a decentralized, worker-managed model. In other words, factories were nationalized, but workers had rights to a part of the profits. The system of socialist self-management was introduced in the 1950s, ostensibly to hand more control over to worker councils, but in truth it allowed the Communist leadership to maintain tight control over crucial economic decisions. Instead of introducing a market economy, Tito experimented with "market socialism," the term used for economic reforms in 1965; and after those reforms failed, he tested the new concept called "consensus economics" in 1968. Gaps in the level of development of different regions were the consequence of choices made in Yugoslavia's earliest days, when Stalin's model was copied through developing heavy industry. People in underdeveloped parts of Yugoslavia accused Slovenia, Croatia, and Serbia of pursuing economic exploitation, and this argument fed Albanian nationalism in particular. On the other hand, more developed republics had their own grievances about insufficiently planned and ineffective investments in the underdeveloped regions.

Yugoslavia's geostrategic position was directly related to the state of its economy, which depended on loans from the West. After Yugoslavia was isolated from the Soviet camp in 1948, Tito made a secret security pact with the United States as a defense against Soviet invasion. He promised that, in the case of a Soviet incursion through Hungary into northern Italy, the Yugoslav Army would fight to defend the Maribor-Trieste-Gorizia axis. This mutual assistance agreement between Yugoslavia and the United States was signed in 1951, and afterward Yugoslavia began to receive generous economic aid under the

Marshall Plan as the United States started the transfer of a large quantity of heavy weapons from its stocks in Germany.[47]

While borrowing from private Western banks would prove to be a big mistake, it was a temptation Yugoslavia could not resist after the 1973 oil shock. The Yugoslav foreign debt was $3.5 billion in 1972, but at the time of Tito's death nine years later it had reached more than $20.5 billion. Tito's death also coincided with the debt payment deadline as well as the consequences of a second oil shock in 1979. In early 1980s loan negotiations, the International Monetary Fund forced the Yugoslav government into austerity measures and a reform package, which included price liberalization and the establishment of realistic loan interest rates.[48]

In the power vacuum caused by Tito's death in May 1980, conflicts between republic-level leaders emerged into the open. It is against this background, and amid an economic crisis, that demonstrations in Kosovo not only had such a damaging effect on the situation in Kosovo but also became determinants of future relations within the Yugoslav Federation. What started with students protesting for better academic conditions transformed into massive street protests in which Albanians demanded a "Kosovo Republic."[49] The regime responded with unprecedented cruelty. Special police forces were deployed, the Yugoslav Federal Army intervened, and a state of emergency was declared. Officially, twelve people died and more than 150 were wounded; but foreign journalists and human rights observers were not allowed into the province, so the real figures may have been higher.[50] Mass arrests and political trials followed, and it seemed as if Kosovo was back in the Ranković era. Around sixteen hundred people were charged with counterrevolutionary activities; university students, and in some cases even minor children who attended secondary school, were among those given jail sentences.[51]

In December 1981, the Central Committee of Serbian Communists held a lengthy three-day meeting. The leading issue on the agenda was Serbia's relationship with its provinces, Kosovo and Vojvodina. The prevailing opinion was that there was a need to reduce the autonomy of the provinces in order to prevent the disintegration of Serbia. Other controversial conclusions from the meeting were disturbing for Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. One was that Serbia was the republic of all Serbs living throughout Yugoslavia. Leading non-Serb Communists interpreted this as "equivalent, indirectly at least, to floating the idea of Greater Serbia."[52] A second provocative declaration from the meeting was that Yugoslavia was composed of five national republics, plus Bosnia and Herzegovina, and of only five constituent nations; any mention of the Muslim nation was explicitly omitted, denying its national identity and treating Bosnia and Herzegovina as an "a-national republic and an artificial construct."[53]

Openly nationalistic views expressed by Serbian Communists did not help them garner support from representatives of other republics at the federal level to change the 1974 constitution. Statements of Serbian territorial ambitions made openly in the highest republic-level Serbian Communist body were a warning signal for others, especially Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, both of which had sizable Serb populations within their borders. It seemed as if the dissolution of Yugoslavia was already an option on the table; and Serbia alerted other republics as early as 1981 that, in the case of a split up, it would give up neither Serbs nor the territory they inhabited. The other republics refused changes to the 1974 constitution in an effort to hold their ground and preserve the balance of power.

After the demonstrations in Kosovo in 1981, an exodus of Serbs from Kosovo became the primary political flashpoint in Serbia. The reasons Serbs were leaving Kosovo were rather complex, and among them was the fact that, despite the federal investment and development that had taken place there, Kosovo still had the lowest standard of living in Yugoslavia. As Albanians improved their positions in society and started to assert their rights after 1966, fewer lucrative jobs were available for Serbs—jobs they had been used to receiving during the period of discrimination against Albanians. Albanian nationalism in Kosovo, inspired by neighboring Albania, was also on the rise. All these factors contributed to national mistrust and evoked memories of the Ranković era. National relations in Kosovo seemed frankly beyond repair, especially because the Kosovar leadership failed to appropriately address the emigration of Serbs. When Slobodan Milošević came to power, feelings of insecurity among Serbs escalated under the influence of exaggerated media reports about Serb victimization. Yet a media campaign meant to manufacture fear and ethnic stereotyping of Albanians had started long before the emergence of Milošević—stories that ethnic Albanians raped Serb women and killed Serb men were favorites among propagandists.[54]

The buildup of this campaign escalated in January 1986 when some two hundred Serbian intellectuals signed a petition claiming that the Serb population in Kosovo was being exposed to genocide. The idea that genocide had been committed against Serbs in Kosovo was further endorsed by the Serbian Academy of Science and Arts (SANU), the most respected of Serbian intellectual institutions, in a memorandum that was leaked to the press on September 24, 1986. The memorandum described the victimization of Serbs in Yugoslavia as systematic, and it further alleged that the federation was constructed in such a way as to exploit Serbs economically and weaken them politically. The Communist Party of Yugoslavia, the memorandum claimed, was suffering from an anti-Serb bias, and two key persons were to blame: Tito, a Croat, and Edvard Kardelj, a Slovene. The SANU authors asserted that a policy of "a strong Yugoslavia, a weak Serbia" had undermined the Serb people by dividing them among several federal units and had levied its final blow in the 1974 constitution when the two provinces of Vojvodina and Kosovo were relieved of Serbian jurisdiction.

Complicating matters, attempts in the 1980s to implement economic stabilizing measures, including a price freeze, which it was thought would halt inflation and slow the downfall of the Yugoslav economy, had failed. In 1987, a three-figure inflation rate was recorded, at 167 percent. That year, an unprecedented move by the Slovenian leadership demonstrated an end to forced and feigned unity for the sake of public consumption by the Yugoslav leadership. Slovenian delegates in the Federal Assembly decided not to endorse the draft resolution on economic policy for 1988, effectively blocking implementation of the federal budget. The Slovenian refusal reflected what was soon to become a more open clash between 1987 and 1991, in the conflict between two different concepts—a market economy and decentralization, on the one hand, and retention of power concentrated at the federal level, on the other hand. Given the structure of Yugoslavia, these different conceptions of the old and the new could not be discussed without taking into account the national framework. Thus, every economic and political issue would boil down to the national question.

While Ivan Stambolić, president of the Republic of Serbia when the SANU memorandum was written, condemned the ideas it promoted, Milošević remained silent. In truth, Stambolić was himself known for being a nationalist, and it was during his rule that Serbian media began the practice of exploiting the cause of Kosovar Serbs for political purposes. In fact, Milošević would not have had a career without Stambolić, who used his position to lobby for Milošević's promotion to the head of Serbia's largest bank, and then managed to install Milošević at the top of the Serbian Communist Party in 1986. Not even a year afterward, Milošević—strengthened by the nationalist cause—turned his back on his mentor and ousted him from power. But Milošević did not stop there. When, in a twist of fate, Stambolić was courted by the United States to overthrow Milošević in 2000, Stambolić was abducted and assassinated.[55] The relationship between Stambolić and Milošević, and Stambolić's tragic end, offer insight into the dangerous personality of the newer Serbian leader, who had been endorsed by the Serbian Academy of Science and Arts in the spring of 1987 with unconditional support. The polarizing nature of Milošević's character eventually led even his former sponsor and friend Stambolić to say not long before his disappearance that Milošević "must be destroyed."[56]

MYTH AND REALPOLITIK

One of Slobodan Milošević's greatest political successes, in which he rooted much propaganda, was his hijacking of Kosovo—the cradle of Serbian mythology. Ivan Stambolić had first sent Milošević there on April 24, 1987, where he attended a meeting of three hundred party delegates, mainly Albanians, in the town of Kosovo Polje. When the meeting began, there were a small number of Serbs and Montenegrins demonstrating outside the building; shortly after Milošević arrived at 6 P.M. the crowd grew to around fifteen thousand people who tried to enter the building by force. When demonstrators began throwing stones, the police—mainly ethnic Albanians—started using force, beating the crowd back with batons. Milošević requested a half-hour break, walked outside, instructed the police to stop their use of force, and turned to the demonstrators, saying protectively: "No one should dare to beat you; no one should dare to beat you!" He then addressed the crowd from the second-floor window and invited from the mass of demonstrators an additional hundred delegates, representing Serb and Montenegrin interests from other regions in Kosovo, to join the meeting.[57] The meeting lasted fourteen hours, during which Milošević carefully listened to the grievances and accusations of Serbs against the Kosovar Albanian political leadership.

This was a decisive night in Milošević's career, and it also helped shape the future course of events in Serbia and in Yugoslavia; the power of a few television cameras and the simplicity of Milošević's sound bite, opportunely repeated twice, connected him inseparably with the cause of Kosovar Serbs. He had proven his ability to control the masses, something other Serbian and Yugoslav leaders lacked at the time. And as the rest of Yugoslavia watched his rise to political power with fear, this episode made Milošević supremely popular not only with the Serbian public but among the highest Communist ranks as well.[58]

The economic situation was dire throughout Yugoslavia, but it was most unstable in Serbia, which was hit by a wave of mass strikes in 1987. Strikers were motivated by genuine dissatisfaction, and workers carried signs and chanted slogans saying: "Workers, students, peasants—stick together, the leaders are all thieves!" "We want new, younger leaders," "We want politics and economics apart," "The leadership is manipulating the working class," and so on. The national issue, soon to be commandeered by Milošević and Serbian nationalist hardliners, was not forgotten by strikers, and some of the workers' signs read: "We want a new Constitution" and "You sold out Kosovo."[59]

In 1988, a Protest Committee was formed in Kosovo to foster solidarity between Kosovar Serbs and Montenegrins. Its members were nationalists who used the Kosovo issue as an excuse to stage demonstrations and rallies in other parts of Yugoslavia. This nationalist movement, which began in 1987, was called the "antibureaucratic" revolution to cloak its real purpose. Economic dissatisfaction on the part of Serbs was aligned with the national question as channeled by Milošević and Serbian radicals, who alleged imperiled national interests of the Serbs in Yugoslavia. While Kosovo was at the center of the protests, the actual aim of the campaign was to depose the provincial and Montenegrin leadership not under the control of Milošević, and to secure Milošević's dominance in the Yugoslav Federation.

In the summer of 1988, a series of rallies were held throughout Serbia. The links between Milošević and the Protest Committee established by Serbs and Montenegrins in Kosovo—which was behind the allegedly spontaneous demonstrations—were obvious. While the rest of the Yugoslav federal leadership condemned these demonstrations, Milošević openly supported their cause and their political demands, providing them legitimacy. Belgrade media, particularly broadcasts of Belgrade Radio and TV, generously helped publicize slogans from rallies across Yugoslavia. Messages from the protests, which had initially been of a mainly social character, escalated into violent and threatening nationalistic petitions, such as "We want weapons," "Death to Albanians," "Long live Serbia," "Montenegro is Serbia," and more, and along with chanting these slogans, many demonstrators carried pictures of Milošević.

Milošević wielded this newfound power to manipulate the masses on the one hand as he successfully toppled disobedient political leadership on the other, installing those more compliant to him in Vojvodina, Kosovo, and Montenegro. By the beginning of 1989, with the help of the so-called antibureaucratic revolution, the balance of power had shifted strongly in Milošević's favor. In January 1989, he controlled four of eight votes in the federal presidency. All he needed to consolidate his authority was control of the Federal Army; but despite the fact that a majority of the officers were Serbs who supported nationalist rhetoric, he continued to lack the army's open support.

Still, the reorganization of the Yugoslav Army command structure and the redistribution of its forces, which took place in 1987 and 1988, resulted in the concentration of a majority of command power in Serbia. When the time came, this restructuring made it easier for Milošević to use the army toward his own ends. The leadership of the other republics was already afraid of that scenario but nonetheless silently accepted these changes. The critical mass necessary to oppose the reorganization was absent in the federal presidency, in which national rifts were already evident.[60]

A conflict between Slovenia, the most liberal of the republics, and the Yugoslav Army, began in 1987 and worked in Milošević's favor. Slovenian liberal intellectuals backed by the media started a campaign against the army, culminating at the beginning of 1988 in the exposure of corruption on the part of Defense Minister Admiral Branko Mamula. Upon his return from an official visit to Ethiopia, the Slovenian weekly *Mladina* published an article calling Mamula "the salesman of death" for arms deals he had made with the Ethiopian Army, which intended to use the weapons against its own famine-ridden population. In the same article, he was accused of using conscripts to build his villa on the Croatian coast.[61] The scandal forced Mamula into an early retirement, but the army retaliated several months later. In May 1988, Janez Janša, an analyst for *Mladina* on military affairs, was arrested with three others on charges of betraying military secrets; the trial made them Slovenian national heroes. The episode not only poisoned relations between Slovenia and the Federal Army forever, reactions from the Slovenian public made it obvious that they were ready to leave the Yugoslav Federation, which they regarded as oppressive and under Serbian control.[62]

Liberalization of the Slovenian media followed a national renaissance in the cultural sphere. While the decline of socialist ideology in Serbia had spurred the development of nostalgic and aggressive nationalism, Slovenian nationalism took on a more postmodern cast, best illustrated by the cultural movement known as Neue Slowenische Kunst, a German phrase meaning "New Slovenian Art." Its music and visual art drew on totalitarian symbols, or rather on totalitarian kitsch. Perhaps the most controversial was a poster that won a prize at an Annual Youth Day event on May 25, which continued to be celebrated on Tito's birthday even after his death; the poster caused outrage among authorities when it was revealed—a replica of a Nazi poster from 1930, the new incarnation replacing the flag of Nazi Germany with the Yugoslav flag and the German eagle with the dove. This degree of freedom to parody totalitarian regimes was too much for the Communist hierarchy, and the issue of *Mladina* that reproduced the poster on its cover page was banned.[63]

A new generation of Slovenians now dictated public discourse, and compared to the rest of Yugoslavia, its members were ahead of the curve not only in mocking Marxisim-Leninism but also in raising environmental issues, lobbying for conscientious objection to military service, and—in what was forward thinking even for some Western European countries at the time—promoting gay rights.

Slovenian Communists did not differ from their colleagues in other republics in lacking the decisiveness to resist Milošević and his policies. But they were forced to follow the current of Slovenian media and opposition, and the dominant public discourse, which they no longer controlled. On February 27, 1989, the Slovenian opposition organized a rally of support for Albanians in Kosovo—who were by then being exposed to apartheid-like measures by the Serbs—and Slovenian Communists decided to attend, marking the beginning of the period of open opposition to Milošević.

Although the principal targets of Serbian propagandists were Albanians, and occasionally Bosnian Muslims and Croats, this rally repositioned Slovenians as primary targets as well. SANU memorandum themes connecting exploitation of the Serbs to Slovene Edvard Kardelj were exploited by the media; but Milošević also exerted economic pressure by shutting down markets for Slovenian products in Kosovo, Vojvodina, and Serbia. Following the six-hundredth anniversary of the Battle of Kosovo in June 1989, commemorated by Milošević with open warmongering, it became obvious that Yugoslavia had reached its end. Three months later the Slovenian Parliament passed constitutional amendments that ended the era of a one-party system; the League of Communists voluntarily gave up its power monopoly, and the right of secession from Yugoslavia was confirmed.[64]

Profound changes that took place in the European political environment in the second half of 1989 significantly impacted the destiny of Yugoslavia. Soviet regimes in Eastern Europe were falling apart one after the other. In Poland, at the end of August, Christian Democrat and Solidarity movement leader Tadeusz Mazowiecki became the first non-Communist prime minister in Central and Eastern Europe. And on November 9, the East German government opened up the Berlin Wall, constructed in 1961 to divide East from West Germany. Images of people tearing down the Wall were broadcast throughout the world, and its fall became the symbol of the end of Communism in Europe. The event was also the first step toward unification for Germany, and the official reunification plan was declared by German chancellor Helmut Kohl at the end of November. Romania was next, with the fall of Ceausescu's government in December. His regime, regarded as the harshest of all Communist regimes in Europe, ended in the execution of him and his wife. Because of the speed and dynamics of these myriad changes to the European political landscape, the political crisis in Yugoslavia was not seen by Western decision makers as important. But by turning a blind eye and taking a passive stance, the West contributed to the fall of Yugoslavia—and Milošević took this as a signal that he should feel free to pursue his plans "to control a recentralized Yugoslav federation."[65]

At the Fourteenth Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, held in January 1990, varying conceptions of the future of Yugoslavia were finally openly at odds. It was the opportunity Milošević needed to demonstrate just how much power he held in his hands. The voting system was based on the principle of one man, one vote, but the size of the delegations from each republic was determined as a proportion of republic-level party membership. In the wake of his antibureaucratic revolution, Milošević had an obvious advantage, and he asserted it. Not only were no amendments put forth by Slovenians accepted, the Slovenian delegates were shouted at when they attempted to explain their views. Humiliated, the only face-saving option was a walkout. To shocked viewers across Yugoslavia, watching the congress on a live broadcast, it became clear right then that the Slovenians were not leaving temporarily. And of course, they were never to return again. After the Slovenian departure, the delegations from Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Macedonia also refused to participate in the proceedings of the congress. This marked not only the end of the Yugoslav Communist Party but also, in a sense, the end of Communism in Yugoslavia altogether.

Shortly after walking out of the congress, the Slovenian Communist Party renamed itself the Party of Democratic Renewal. In both Croatia and Slovenia, by decision of the Communist leadership, multiparty elections were held in the spring of 1990, and the Communist slates lost. In Slovenia, the parliamentary elections were won by the liberal-nationalist coalition, the Democratic Opposition of Slovenia (DEMOS), which advocated sovereignty and economic independence for the republic; former Communist leader Milan Kučan won the presidential election. In Croatia, the opposition—the Croatian Democratic Union (HDZ) led by Franjo Tuđman—won a convincing victory.

Serbia's new constitution, adopted on September 28, 1990, formalized all of Milošević's victories and affirmed the Republic of Serbia's "sovereignty and independence." At the same time, Milošević denied the right of other Yugoslav republics to similarly proclaim their sovereignty. Serbia claimed its right to all the benefits of confederation while also claiming the right to coerce other republics to remain subordinate. By removing the word "Socialist" from the title of the republic, Serbia officially recognized that a shift in ideology had taken place. The name of the province of Kosovo was also changed, to Kosovo and Metohija (KiM), and the autonomy of both Vojvodina and KiM was officially abolished.

While there were still serious political attempts on the part of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia, and Slovenia to transform Yugoslavia into a confederation, Serbia did everything it could to sabotage a peaceful process. Milošević acted in line with the SANU memorandum, using the Serb populations in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia to instigate violence. After referendums on independence, leadership in both Slovenia and Croatia declared the secession of their republics from the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia on June 25, 1991. This course of action was decided on only when it became obvious that the Serbian leadership was neither interested in a confederation nor motivated to negotiate a consensual solution to independence.

The Yugoslav Army launched a war on Slovenia two days after the republic's formal declaration of independence, on June 17, 1991, which lasted only ten days. Under the political sponsorship of the European Union, an agreement known as the Brijuni Accord was signed on the Croatian island of Brijuni; it ended the war, and Croatia and Slovenia agreed to suspend political activities related to independence for three months.

After the war in Slovenia, the Yugoslav Army openly took up Milošević's cause to create a Greater Serbia. The war in Croatia began almost immediately after the Brijuni Accord was signed.[66] But even before the war in Croatia started, Serb leaders there and in Bosnia and Herzegovina made it clear that they would accept nothing less than "a complete Serbian entity."[67]

Implementation of this plan got under way in Croatia with the Association of Municipalities, a claiming of territories—later collectively designated the Serb Autonomous Region—meant to prepare for their secession from Croatia to join a Greater Serbia. The first armed clashes occurred when Croatian Serbs established their own Ministry of Internal Affairs, and started taking over legitimate Croatian police stations by force, beginning in Pakrac on March 2, 1991.[68] The Yugoslav Army intervened under the pretense that it had to stop the "ethnic conflict," but really it supported the Croatian Serb insurgency. In July 1991, under Milošević's supervision, the Yugoslav Army and other Serb forces, along with Croatian Serb rebels, launched a war against Croatian civilians. Almost the entire non-Serb population in Serb-held Croatia (an estimated 168,000 Croats and an unknown number of other ethnic groups) was "forcibly removed or killed," and Catholic churches were burned.[69] The bombardment of Dubrovnik, the siege of Vukovar, and the ruthless killing of Croatian civilians received extensive Western media coverage, but the international community did nothing to stop the carnage.

The United States, the only international power that could have stopped Milošević and the Yugoslav People's Army (JNA), simply refused to act. This passivity practically licensed Milošević's war against Croatia, and later on against Bosnia and Herzegovina. Banac cites two key causes for the U.S. position. One was that the American administration favored Yugoslavia as a unitarist state. The other was related to the obsession of American policy at the time with the disintegration of the Soviet Union. "American diplomats judged both situations as analogous and concluded that the break-up of Yugoslavia would be extremely dangerous and destabilizing."[70]

European powers, despite different entrenched views, did not counter the U.S. position. They also dogmatically supported Yugoslav unity. Even Germany, often viewed as a country that was at least uncomfortable with Yugoslav unity, initially opposed the independence of Slovenia and Croatia. The Germans also viewed the Yugoslav crises through the Soviet lens. According to Gerhard Almer, a German diplomat serving in Yugoslavia at the time, the sense was that Yugoslavia's disintegration was "a bad example for Soviet disintegration, and this was bad for [Germans, who] needed a Soviet Union capable of action," in order to achieve German unity.[71]

A U.N.-sponsored ceasefire was signed between Croatia and the JNA in Sarajevo in January 1992, and it included a demilitarization agreement. Though the JNA left a good deal of weapons in the hands of Croatian Serb militias, demilitarization meant in reality that there was significant deployment of JNA tanks throughout Bosnia; it was the ideal preparation for a new conflict that would begin that spring as the political crisis in Bosnia deepened.

THE PROPAGANDA WAR

Long before Milošević acquired control over the JNA's heavy artillery, he had begun another kind of war—to conquer the hearts and minds of Serbs in Serbia, Croatia, and Bosnia. The modern Serbian propaganda machine, and Slobodan Milošević at its head, depended on an alliance with Serbian media that was obvious from his first ascendance to power. From his visit to Kosovo Polje in 1987—when he declared to Serbs there that "No one should dare to beat you!"—Milošević used all available legal (and illegal) measures to control the independent press, to ensure that both print and broadcast journalists dutifully followed the propaganda line imposed by his government. Even Milošević's closest allies have admitted in retrospect that the media were important to him from the earliest days of his rule, and that he paid special attention to choosing people for the editorial positions of the most influential media in Serbia.[72]

Milošević organized and supervised his propaganda cabal personally, but hateful propaganda was not something Serbian media had to learn anew from

Milošević when he came to power. Coloring reports with nationalistic tones had begun in Serbia in 1981 during the demonstrations of Kosovo Albanians and was supported by the Serbian Communist Party; even before Milošević ascended to the heights of party leadership, a significant number of journalists had already integrated negative ethnic stereotyping into their writing about Kosovar Albanians.

Though conceptions of propaganda differ among various scholars, as do their understandings and opinions of its effects, there are some definitions about which there is general consensus; for one, "Propaganda is the deliberate and systematic attempt to shape perceptions, manipulate cognition, and direct behavior to achieve a response that furthers the desired intent of the propagandists."[73] Jacques Ellul also stresses the importance of psychological influence: "Propaganda is a set of methods employed by an organized group to bring about the active or passive participation in its actions of a mass of individuals, psychologically unified through psychological manipulations and incorporated in an organization."[74] In an even broader definition, propaganda encompasses the activities of all legitimate governments who use the media to gain support for their political programs; but it is when propaganda is employed in an autocratic manner or for the purposes of warmongering that it becomes nefarious.

There are some common features shared by all propaganda campaigns in order for them to be effective, and the most concise summary of these was presented by Renaud de La Brosse in an Expert Report prepared for the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia in the case against Slobodan Milošević. In his introduction of the concept, de La Brosse noted that propaganda "may certainly be viewed as war prosecuted by other means," and in the case of Serbia, it is easy to argue that indeed the first half of the wars against both Croatia and Bosnia took place in media outlets, not on the battlefield. The framework within which de La Brosse analyzed use of the Serbian media during the period of Milošević's rule highlighted six fundamental principles of effective propaganda.

The first, *Keep it simple*, is played out in clear, short phrases that condense a political doctrine in a way that is easy for the masses to remember. Slogans so loaded with passion that they are "more like a war cry," along with symbols (including songs such as those frequently used to rally Serb troops during the conflict in Bosnia) that have "magical or mystical connotations," are often disseminated. De La Brosse's second principle, *Project your own intentions onto others*, is a commonly used method that attributes one's own intentions to an enemy and is designed not only to deceive the wider public but also to justify the use of violence to one's own public. This is a highly useful technique for inciting fear among members of a population and mobilizing them to commit unspeakable crimes; because the "others" allegedly want to do the same to them. For Milošević, the long-brewing sense among Serbs that they were unfairly treated in Yugoslavia was the ideal base for the creation of a perceived existential crisis at the hands of the "others," whom he in fact wished to do away with.

Perhaps the most obvious principle of propaganda is *Use the news to your advantage*. This technique requires tight control of the media—which must support the official version of conditions on the ground—and again works through labels and commentary that play on the enthusiasm for one side or hatred of another; the importance or significance of reported facts is inevitably exaggerated. Further, systematic repetition of the main theme or themes of a propagandistic message is necessary in order for it to become ingrained in the minds of the masses; thus de La Brosse identified his fourth principle as *Repeat your message endlessly*. To avoid the danger that people will grow tired of hearing the same message, it must be changed over time and followed up with "new information, 'evidence,' revelations, and shock phrases" that reinvigorate the cause and attach it to any noteworthy events.

While Milošević was unquestionably masterful at using the media to his advantage, he employed the fifth principle highlighted by de La Brosse with particular adeptness. This principle, *Rely on myths and history*, is based in the idea that, in order to be fully effective, propaganda depends on a preexisting "fertile ground." Usually, mythology or the historic prejudices of a group of people are exploited; after all, propaganda is always most effective when it plays on prejudices and preconceptions, as by doing so it reassures the masses that their already existing beliefs and opinions are valid and unifying. It is this unifying mandate that sets the place for the sixth principle identified by de La Brosse, *Create a national consensus*. Effective propaganda, he notes, seeks "to develop a feeling of unanimity in the population by anticipating that individual opinions will conform with publicly professed opinion." Often, respected public figures are held up as examples—and in the wake of their prestige, a contagion effect can result when they subscribe to the cause that is being promoted. Propagandists strive to gain a generalized acceptance of their message. Through the media, or in demonstrations and parades, both fear and exaltation can be aroused in people. The aim is to occupy the most ground, multiply shows of force, and demonstrate superiority over the enemy. Such a system naturally leads people to denounce as traitors those who cast doubt on or oppose the espoused common cause.

In this way, the function of the media under Milošević was to denounce and ostracize those who, at one time or another, were in a position to publicly question or protest against the prevailing ultranationalism. The independent media, human rights organizations, and any of those who were brave enough to oppose official policy were accused of being traitors against the national cause.[75] The message was that Serbs belonged, that leaving "their" land was akin to defeat and amounted to failing their ancestors. Milošević told Serbs in Kosovo, "You should stay here. This is your land. These are your houses. Your meadows and gardens. Your memories. You shouldn't abandon your land just because it's difficult to live, because you are pressured by injustice and degradation. It was never part of the Serbian and Montenegrin character to give up in the face of obstacles, to demobilize when it's time to fight. . . . You should stay here for the sake of your ancestors and descendants. Otherwise your ancestors would be defiled and descendants disappointed."[76]

Besides the alleged exploitation of Serbs in Yugoslavia ("injustice and degradation," according to Milošević), there were two other overarching themes that his propaganda apparatus used to inspire fear of other Yugoslav nations among Serbs, primarily of Croats and Bosnian Muslims. One was the myth of the Battle of Kosovo, based on a six-hundred-year-old legend derived from little historical fact. The other was based in history, but a rather narrow and misleading interpretation of it; it is the story of genocide against Serbs committed by Nazi and Ustasha forces during World War II.

THE KOSOVO FACTOR

The Kosovo myth occupies a particularly special place in Serbian culture and national identity. It is widely understood that Serbian nationalism is strongly rooted in the epic tale of the Battle of Kosovo, which is often cited as a seminal event in the history of the Serbs. "Kosovo is held by almost all Serbs as the sacred site of national history, the fountainhead of national spirit, and the guarantor of national values. The old patriarchate of the Serbian Orthodox Church lies in Kosovo, and the medieval battle which symbolized the fall of the Serbian empire occurred in Kosovo."[77] After the Serbian Army faced the Ottomans there in 1389, Kosovo emerged as a symbol of Serbian nationalist and religious strength when the church deftly portrayed the death of Prince Lazar as an act of heroism. The battle for Kosovo was one of attrition on both sides, and surrender to the Ottomans—effectively annexing Serbia to the empire—left a residue of pessimism and a national identity crisis in its wake. But the Serbian Orthodox Church, headquartered in Kosovo, managed to turn Lazar's defeat into a moral victory. "It is better to die in battle than die ashamed," was one of the strongest messages devised for and used in Serbian propaganda after the loss in Kosovo, and it offered a way for Serbs to overcome the humiliation of having capitulated to the Ottomans.[78]

This myth, begun by the church, continued to grow in the oral tradition of Serb peasants, often in song. While ostensibly the church aimed simply to sustain a sense of national belonging, what it actually encouraged could more aptly be classified as a special form of cultural nationalism, closely tied to religion. Analyzing the development of cultural nationalism based on myths, John Hutchinson has observed that intellectual circles, which initiate myths and are fully aware of their strength, combine a romantic search for meaning with a scientific zeal to establish authoritative foundations, "for only by recovering the history of the nation through all its triumphs and disasters can its members rediscover their authentic purpose. These histories typically form a set of repetitive 'mythic' patterns, containing a migration story, a founding myth, a golden age of cultural splendor, a period of inner decay, and a promise of regeneration."[79]

Having adopted a "repetitive mythic pattern," the Kosovo myth fits this definition of cultural nationalism. And since 1389, this pattern has served the Serbian Orthodox Church and nationalist-oriented intellectuals in convincing the Serb people that they must work actively to maintain their national identity. The myth has thrived perennially, especially in families; but in times of political crisis, Serb elites have worked emphatically to engender the myth with even greater vitality. Serbian writer Vasa Mihailović has argued the importance of keeping the myth alive, saying that whenever Serbs face events of great historical significance, the Kosovo myth is a source of strength and inspiration.[80]

The Kosovo myth is based on a 1389 battle in which both armies suffered such enormous losses that there are even disagreements among historians as to whether it was a victory for the Serbs or for the Ottomans. Leaders on both sides were killed, and while the Serbs lost Prince Lazar, the Ottoman side lost Sultan Murad. There were very few survivors, and therefore almost no eyewitnesses. But the truth of the battle has proved unimportant in the development of a myth that has influenced generations of Serbs, because the historical facts have remained in the shadow of the legend.[81]

On the June 28, 1989, commemoration of the six-hundredth anniversary of the Battle of Kosovo, Slobodan Milošević noted that the gap between myth and fact was inconsequential: "Today, it is difficult to say what is true and what is legend about the Battle of Kosovo. Today, that is not even important."[82] On that day in Kosovo, and throughout his political career, what mattered to Milošević and to Serbian decision makers was only that the story of Kosovo held unlimited propagandistic potential.[83]

The Battle of Kosovo

But what is so special about the ancient Kosovo myth that it so fruitfully served the modern conception of propaganda employed so masterfully by Milošević?

As the story is told, when it became obvious that Ottoman troops were preparing to invade, Saint Elias sent a messenger to visit Lazar. The prince was given the choice between a heavenly kingdom or an earthly kingdom. If he chose the earthly kingdom, he was told, the entire Ottoman Army would perish; but if he chose the heavenly kingdom, the messenger promised a place for Serbs in heaven forever but said, "Your entire army will perish, and you, Prince, will perish with it."[84] The prince, it is said, chose martyrdom—the heavenly kingdom—and therein lies the seed of myth. It was this version of the Kosovo story, this ecclesiastical telling, which framed the tale as one of sacrifice in the face of the evil Ottoman oppressor, that first imbued Serb culture and inspired much medieval Serb poetry.

But there have been many interpretations of the Kosovo myth over time, and it is indeed this plasticity that has given the story so much power. Evolving in the centuries after the Battle of Kosovo, the story has "assumed a more nuanced character, and its mythology extended beyond a religious interpretation."[85] A more secularized and moralistic version of the myth that emerged, still rich with biblical parallels, highlighted events that took place between Prince Lazar and his closest advisers on the eve of battle. This more complex interpretation added new layers to the propagandistic impact of the Kosovo myth in Serbian culture. In it, Lazar hosts a banquet with twelve of his noblemen—a setting obviously borrowed from Christ's Last Supper. Having been accused of treason by his son-in-law Vuk Branković, Lazar's brother-in-law Miloš Obilić, deeply hurt by this slander, vows to prove his loyalty to the prince in the coming battle. Obilić—who is said to have kept his word to Lazar by infiltrating the Turkish side and assassinating Sultan Murad—claims that Branković is the real traitor. Some depictions of Branković echo the Bible's story of Judas; and just as "Judas" has become synonymous with betrayal in English-speaking cultures, so "Branković" has in Serb culture.

Whether Branković was indeed a traitor is unknown; he is represented in some versions of the myth as no worse than a coward and in others as having betrayed Lazar by fleeing the field of battle and leaving the prince to his death. But, Prince Lazar and Miloš Obilić find their archetypal contrast in the traitorous Branković. His alleged betrayal, in other words, solidifies them as "two embodiments of heroic virtue."[86] Lazar, whom the myth credits with having secured a place for Serbs in heaven, took on obvious symbolism as a national martyr; and Obilić became a symbol of the ideal Serb hero, "who sacrifices himself in order to strike a blow against tyranny."[87]

The death of Lazar in the Kosovo myth has been interpreted by many Serbs as representing the death of the Serbian nation, the resurrection of which will be possible only after his killers (*its* killers) are purged from "Serbian lands." Through this filter, according to Michael Sells, Vuk Branković "represents the Slavs who converted to Islam under the Ottomans and any Serb who would live with them and tolerate them."[88] The scene at the six-hundred-year anniversary of the Battle of Kosovo was a testimony to the symbolic power of both of these mythologized figures for political purposes.

Evoking the spirit of Lazar, Milošević alit on a Kosovo field from the heavens that day. As he stepped out of a helicopter, the crowd cheering, Milošević transitioned from silent symbolism to powerful oration. "Six hundred years ago," he bellowed, "disharmony struck us." Further, he claimed, "disharmony and betrayal have followed the Serbian people throughout its history," and even in the modern era the "disharmony of Serbian politicians has set Serbia back, and their inferiority has humiliated Serbia." Thus, "six centuries later, we are again in battle and on the eve of battle. These are not armed battles, though armed battles are not out of the question. But, regardless of what kind of battles we are talking about, they cannot be won without decisiveness, courage, and sacrifice."[89]

In his speech, Milošević used familiar words heard perpetually in retellings of the Kosovo myth to conjure Prince Lazar without directly mentioning him; words like disharmony, betrayal, courage, sacrifice, and battle. The passive way in which he referred to disharmony ("disharmony struck us") served to relieve Serbs of collective responsibility for their own vassal position and allowed him to point a finger at disloyal politicians, traitors comparable to Vuk Branković. Serbian nationalist leadership had promoted the idea since the early 1980s that Serbs received inferior treatment in Yugoslavia, and in his speech Milošević linked this sentiment with the vassal status of Serbs during the Ottoman Empire. By distancing himself from disloyal politicians and promising future battles that might require "decisivness, courage, and sacrifice," Milošević identified himself with the average Serb. His speech was rich with inferences, about untrustworthy politicians (and here Milošević meant not only nonnationalist Serbs but also politicians from other nationalist groups that disapproved of him), about the bravery of Serbs ready for sacrifice, and about his own readiness to take to armed battle if necessary. In short, Milošević installed himself on that day in Kosovo as the ultimate leader of all Serbs in Yugoslavia; he was the new Lazar.

"The Mountain Wreath"

One epic poem that draws inspiration from Kosovo and holds a particularly important place in Serbian and Montenegrin culture is "The Mountain Wreath," published in 1847 by the Montenegrin bishop-ruler Petar II Petrović Njegoš. Its verses—framed as a dialogue between historical Serb figures, led by Njegoš's predecessor Bishop Danilo, and drawing heavily on references to Battle of Kosovo heroes (and traitors)—justify brutality against Muslims by instilling fear of their motives and defining them as the enemy. The poem warns, "Do not deceive yourself! Should they ever catch you . . . [the Turks] would cut off your head that very instant, or they would tie your hands behind your back and torture you." And having established Turks as an existential threat to the Serbs, it continues to lay fertile ground for dehumanizing Muslims ("them") as something other than Serbs ("us")—"Birds of the same feather flock together! Turks are always brothers to each other."[90]

"The Mountain Wreath" is structured largely as a debate about the supremacy of Serbian Orthodoxy versus Islam, with each side exasperated that the other cannot see the obvious wisdom of its own religion; but after seeking guidance from the "orphan" of "True Faith," Danilo (speaking "as if from a dream") rallies his men, "We should baptize with water or with blood those blasphemers of Christ's glorious name. . . . On blood-stained stones let the true altar rise."[91] The poem was written in part to glorify a real historical event, the extermination of Poturs (Islamicized Bosnian Slavs, now known as Bosniaks) from Montenegro. Historians have not reached consensus about exactly when these mass killings occurred, but the decade from 1702 to 1712 is frequently put forward. It is believed that sometime in this period the slaughter of more than a thousand Muslims occurred on Orthodox Christmas Day, January 7. The central character of the poem, Vladika Danilo, like Njegoš, was the bishop-ruler of Montenegro, a highland principality that remained largely outside Ottoman control. In the poem, Danilo summons a council to help him decide what to do with those Montenegrins who converted to Islam, and whom he treats as a Turkish fifth column. But after listening to pleas for peace and coexistence from some members of both delegations, he decides that total extermination of the Muslims is the best solution.

It is noteworthy that the Kosovo myth as well as Njegoš's ruthless glorification of genocide against Muslims in "The Mountain Wreath" were introduced into school curricula in Communist Yugoslavia; and teachers of literature often required that students learn Njegoš's verses by heart. During the mobilization of Serbs for the wars in the former Yugoslavia, these epics were disseminated even more widely through both education and media. This continues in present-day Serbia as well. Serbian anthropologist Ivan Čolović argues that "undoubtedly political ethno-myths stand in the way of the development of a civil, democratic society in Serbia."[92] Čolović agrees with the opinion of German Slavicist Reinhard Lauer—who has compared what happened in Nazi Germany with what occurred in Serbia in the 1990s—that while myths have their place in literature and art in times of peace, "they are very dangerous when they appear outside that context 'in real life' as happens in time of conflict."[93] Čolović and Lauer both recommend that myths not be entirely eliminated, but their negative messages somehow be toned down for pedagogical purposes.[94]

In peacetime, any dehumanizing messages embedded in myths develop at a much slower pace, and thus do not represent a real danger. But in times of crisis or war, aggressive and negative messages are more emphasized in the public sphere as a population cleaves to one "side" or the other of a conflict. "Portraits of the heroic ancestors appear, together with pictures of current leaders, on placards carried by the participants in these rallies, and they are even mentioned in the political information and commentaries carried by the media," says Čolović.[95]

According to Aleksandar Hemon, Bosnian Serb leader Radovan Karadžić, a skillful player of the gusle—a single-stringed instrument that traditionally accompanies the performance of epic poems—understood his contemporary role through the mold of Vladika Danilo in Njegoš's "Mountain Wreath." "He recognized himself in the martyrdom of leadership; he believed that he was the one to finish the job that Vladika Danilo started; he saw himself as the hero in the epic poem that would be sung by a distant future generation."[96] And so, with Karadžić in the role of Danilo and Milošević playing Lazar, a modern clash between the Serbs and the "Turks" was carefully crafted by the Serbian leadership in the fractured and volatile post-Yugoslav context. The martyrdom of Prince Lazar is the keystone of Serbian national mythology, but the survival of this theme lies in its flexibility to adapt over time so that it continues to aid in homogenizing the Serbian people by engendering feelings of exclusiveness over "others." Milošević was a master at combining myth with a manipulative interpretation of history and realpolitik. Though he drew heavily on the Battle of Kosovo in his six-hundredth-anniversary commemoration speech, Milošević added: "Hearkening back to history, in fact, is not the basis upon which to carry out our mobilization. To be sure, history provides an obligation to us to mobilize. However, the main incentive for the mobilization of all Yugoslav peoples and minorities is their present condition."[97]

THE GHOSTS OF WORLD WAR II

Apart from the Kosovo myth, another theme that inspired Serbian propaganda was the genocide committed against Serbs during World War II, mostly by Ustasha forces. The Ustasha—members of a Croatian separatist movement appointed to rule the NDH (Independent State of Croatia), a fascist puppet state established in part of Yugoslavia—indeed committed genocide against Jews, Serbs, and Roma; for they shared the Chetnik (Serb) vision of an ethnically clean state, albeit with a different demographic outcome. Many armed formations emerged throughout the war, and disentangling Yugoslav history during this period has warranted many studies.[98] But it is the residual effects of alliances and aggressions during World War II that revisited Yugoslav society around the time of Tito's death.

Serbian nationalists began promoting the thesis that Croats had joined Ustasha forces en masse and were therefore a "genocidal people." While genocide against Serbs during World War II is an undisputed historical fact, the changing alliances and patterns of crimes committed during the war were complex and convoluted. As Cigar notes, "Serbs, Muslims, and Croats became at the same time victims and perpetrators—though, of course, usually not the same individuals in both cases—in the ethnic and ideological strife that characterized the period."[99]

But Serbian nationalist propaganda discredited Croats who joined the Partisan forces, and many more who resisted fascism in other ways, while at the same time failing to account for crimes committed against Bosnian Muslims and Croats by Chetnik collaborationist forces. Further, the Serbian nationalist narrative positioned Muslims solely in alliance with Ustasha forces. Bosnia and Herzegovina was in fact incorporated into the NDH, as the Croats did not consider Muslims to be of a different nationality and treated them as Croats of the Muslim faith. And a number of Bosnian Muslims did join the Ustasha; but many also joined Tito's Partisan forces. The identification of Bosnian Muslims with the Ustasha, however, coupled with already negative stereotypes and an association with Turks was a lethal combination for Bosniak civilians, many of whom were targeted for extermination by the Chetniks, especially in eastern Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Bosanska Krajina.

Muslim intellectuals openly expressed criticism of the NDH government in order to separate themselves. According to Enver Redžić, "First the Muslims from Sarajevo, then those from Banja Luka, informed their representative in the NDH government, Dr Osman Kulenović, of their concern about the persecution of Serbs by the 'irregular Ustasha' and its ramifications for the Muslim population."[100] The genocide committed by German and Ustasha troops against Serbs and Jews even spurred organized protests by Bosnian Muslims. Distinguished members of the Muslim community opposed the genocidal programs of these governments and made their position clear in resolutions initiated by distinguished members of the Muslim community, in the summer and fall of 1941. These resolutions were signed throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina: in Sarajevo, Prijedor, Mostar, Banja Luka, Bijeljina, and Tuzla. In them, Muslims voiced harsh opposition to the crimes committed against Jews and Serbs, and specifically listed the crimes committed by the Ustasha against these groups. One resolution, signed by one hundred distinguished Muslim intellectuals from Sarajevo, requested the safety of life, dignity, property, and religion for all citizens.[101]

It is not my aim here to document or provide an overview of mass crimes committed during the Second World War, or to discuss the dynamics of different coalitions from 1940 to 1944. But it is worth mentioning that the documentation of Ustasha and Nazi crimes against Jews, Serbs, and Roma was a priority in Serbian historiography, while the crimes committed by Chetniks against Muslims and the Croat population have been relatively cloaked in silence. After the war, this silence was politically motivated, as Tito gave primacy to the ethic of brotherhood and unity over reconciliation, and the obedient acquiescence of domestic historians followed. Once a historical narrative is set, it is difficult to change, and even Western historians long fitted their World War II–era Balkan research within the "politically correct" interpretation that only Jews, Serbs, and Roma were victims. Not surprisingly, it was mainly Bosnian Muslim historians who researched genocide against Muslims during the war, and their research was invariably labeled as ethnically biased.

Since the 1990s, however, more relevant research has been undertaken not only to study genocide against Bosniaks during World War II but also to try to determine why the decades that followed the war were marked by a conspiracy of silence about Bosnian Muslim civilian victims. The importance of work by American historian Max Bergholz on this topic cannot be emphasized enough. Bergholz used a micro-history approach to research the example of a small town located in northwestern Bosnia, where two thousand Bosnian Muslims were massacred by Chetnik forces in September 1941—one of the many mass killings of Bosniaks omitted from the discourse of postwar history in the former Yugoslavia. In his research, Bergholz answers the question of why so many instances of Muslim civilian deaths during the war remained undisclosed. His analysis shows that the Communist-led Partisan movement absorbed large numbers of Serbian insurgents, many of whom had murdered Muslims earlier in the war; in the postwar period, Chetnik assassins who had become Partisan victors were spared prosecution. Chetniks had transferred to the Partisan side in large numbers, and Muslim survivors in such a political climate had no other option but to stay silent.[102]

This historical reticence reaffirmed the official postwar discourse that disregarded Muslims as victims. And this interpretation supported the task of Serbian propagandists to demean Bosniaks so as to exclude them from the "human universe." Labeling them throughout history as aligned with Turkish occupiers and then with Ustasha forces has repeatedly motivated Serb nationalism and no doubt underwrote the process of dehumanization that served as the first precondition in generating public support for genocide against Bosnian Muslims in the 1990s.

PROPAGANDA AT WORK

Themes of the Serbian propaganda endorsed by Slobodan Milošević in 1987 had already started to be formulated shortly after Tito's death by a specific set of members of the Serbian intellectual elite who took it upon themselves to portray the Muslims of Yugoslavia as an alien and inferior nation, and whom Norman Cigar defines as Orientalists.[103] Their attempts to identify Islam and Muslims as opposed to and dangerous to modern civilization extended beyond academic discussions. By giving interviews in public and making strong ties with journalists who supported their cause, these intellectuals slowly set the tone for the Serbian public, only to accelerate the frequency and ruthlessness of their messages at the end of the 1980s.

The themes of Serbian exploitation in Yugoslavia, Kosovo mythology, and the genocide of Serbs in World War II were sometimes framed separately, but they also often overlapped within the same article or television report. Any nation that stood in the way of the creation of a Greater Serbia was portrayed as a threat that was impossible to live with; and the strategy of dehumanization, as defined by genocide theories, was carried out daily to indoctrinate Serbs. Miroljub Jevtić, who was at the center of this campaign, is an example of a propagandist who shrouded his views behind an alleged academic purpose.[104] In an interview subtitled "The Reservists of Allah's Army," Jevtić said that the "acceptance of Islam in Bosnia was a traitorous act." In his demonization of Bosnian Muslims specifically, Jevtić went so far as to give amnesty to Turks and Albanians in the Ottoman Empire, claiming that "domestic Muslims were responsible for genocide" and that they should continue to be held responsible "to the present day." Jevtić has developed this argument further by asserting that the main advocates of Islamic fundamentalism have been Muslims from communist political systems. Though his argument is dedicated to Islamic fundamentalism and the alleged threat from Bosnia, he has freely invoked the Croatian Ustasha as well, calling for Serbs to remember genocide against them, and warning that "history is repeating itself. As long as we do not look truth in the eye, history will continue repeating itself."[105]

There were literary works predating the Orientalists' public campaign that also profoundly impacted the process of dehumanization of Muslims and Croats. One such book was *Nož* (Knife), published in 1982 by Vuk Drašković—who would later become the commander of the militia known as the Serbian Guard. It told the emotional story of a Serbian boy whose family was killed by Muslim Ustashas during World War II, and who was then raised by a Muslim family. Drašković's portrayal of Muslims was in line with their later depiction by Orientalists as traitors. Muslim characters in the book are portrayed as cunning and homicidal, and the author held obviously expressed sympathies for Serbian Chetniks. The book strongly influenced some readers toward nationalism; one admitted: "I beat up many Muslims and Croats on vacation in Cavtat because of his [Drašković's] *Nož*. Reading that book I would see red, get up, select the biggest fellow on the beach, and smash his teeth in."[106]

Sabrina Ramet describes the years from 1981 to 1987, during which *Nož* was constantly in print, as representing a "massive tectonic shift in which perceptions, values and expectations changed dramatically, preparing the way for Slobodan Milošević's seizure of power within the Serbian party apparatus and his launching of his abortive 'antibureuacratic revolution.'"[107] She further argues that in following the outline of the SANU memorandum, the Communist Party's official policy was one of "neuroticization" or even the "psychoticization" of the Serbian public.[108]

The Serbian Orthodox Church also contributed to this process by stirring up memories of Serbian victims from World War II, and insisting in 1990 and 1991 on opening up war-era mass graves, so that the last remains could be reburied. The nationalist leaders of Serbs in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia were Radovan Karadžić and Jovan Rašković—both were psychiatrists who were aware of the importance of playing to the collective psychology of Serbs. They helped the church organize the excavations and the ceremonial carrying of last remains through villages so that they could be interred with proper Orthodox ritual. These were powerful images, and given the heightened political and national tensions at the time, the church bears an immense responsibility for adding to hysteria among the Serbian public.[109]

In a surprisingly honest interview given in January 1992, Rašković, the first leader of the Serb Democratic Party in Croatia, admitted his own culpability in laying the groundwork for war: "I feel responsible because I prepared for this war even if not in terms of military preparations. If I hadn't created this emotional strain in the Serb people, nothing would have happened. My Party and I lit the fuse of Serbian nationalism not only in Croatia but everywhere else in Bosnia and Herzegovina. It's impossible to imagine a Serbian Democratic Party in Bosnia and Herzegovina or Mr. Karadžić in power without our influence . . . I have repeated again and again to [Serbs] that [they] come from heaven not earth."[110]

Scientists Stanley Milgram and Philip Zombardo, in their experiments on the willingness of "regular" people to partake in violence (discussed in chapter 1), were limited by numbers of participants and the boundaries of medical ethics. Still, their shocking results showed that in "total situations," and when people are convinced that authority figures will take responsibility, a disturbing number of ordinary individuals display the capacity to harm other human beings. At the same time that Rašković was expressing accountability for his role in inciting violence and implicitly for violating the ethics of his profession, Radovan Karadžić, his colleague in Bosnia, was preparing Bosnian Serbs for the experiment of a "total situation" with no limits—one in which Serbs allegedly faced such an existential threat that genocide was not only possible but promoted as necessary for self-preservation.

3

"JOINT CRIMINAL ENTERPRISE"

DEMOCRATIZATION AND THE UNSPOKEN OCCUPATION OF BOSNIA

On New Year's Eve, December 31, 1991, U.N. envoy Cyrus Vance lit a candle in front of the Serbian presidency building in Belgrade to symbolize the end of the aggression against the Republic of Croatia by the Yugoslav People's Army (JNA). A peace agreement was signed two days later, in Sarajevo, though the deal had already been sealed at the end of November in Geneva. While visiting Sarajevo, Vance met with Alija Izetbegović, the president of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Addressing the press after their meeting, Vance not only elaborated on the importance of the peace agreement for Croatia but also said that he did not believe the conflict would reach into Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH). His reasoning, and that of other U.N. actors, was that since the war in Croatia was ending, it could no longer spread to Bosnia. Thus, there was no need for U.N. blue helmets to undertake conflict prevention, and Bosnia instead hosted a mission of E.U. observers. But this was skewed logic. Implementation of the U.N. plan, which was supervised by the international community, included redeploying most JNA artillery from Croatia to the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina.[1] Essentially, carrying out the Croatian peace plan meant that, "under the auspices of the international community, the JNA practically occupied Bosnia."[2]

National coalition parties had conflicting reactions to this unspoken occupation—while Serbs welcomed it with open arms, Muslims and Croats anxiously rejected it. Yet those who opposed the occupation had no real power to resist it. Only a year and half prior, Bosnia and Herzegovina had begun the transition from one-party Communist rule to greater political pluralism. Throughout

1990, Communists struggled to obstruct constitutional changes that would allow multiparty elections. In February of that year, the Assembly of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina passed a law ending the registration of parties that were formed based on nationality or religion. But in June 1990 the Constitutional Court overruled this prohibition, declaring it unconstitutional, and the platform for national parties was legalized.[3]

With these constitutional changes and accompanying laws, multiparty elections were to be held on November 18, 1990. The League of Communists of Bosnia and Herzegovina—headed by the charismatic party leader Nijaz Duraković, an outspoken opponent of Slobodan Milošević—changed its name to the League of Communists–Social Democratic Party (SK-SDP) and formed an alliance with the Democratic Socialist Alliance (DSS). In their public outreach, these two parties continued using brotherhood and unity slogans and emphasized Partisan tradition. They had an advantage over nationalist parties due to their large membership and a solid infrastructure throughout Bosnia. But their political program was weak, and at the time of the elections they had still not fully recovered from the consequences of an economic scandal that had taken place in the summer of 1987 and involved top members of the party leadership. It had been discovered then that the republic's biggest agricultural conglomerate, Agrokomerc, based in the small town of Kladuša in Bosanska Krajina, was built on promissory notes totaling $865 million. The Bosnian media used the affair to expose the corruption of those in power. Kemal Kurspahić explains that the media "had helped to weaken the Party and, at the same time, gained a freedom that then had been unknown in either Serbia or Croatia."[4] This freedom in the Bosnian press emerged around the same time that Milošević imposed firmer control over the Serbian media.[5] And although the Bosnian media contributed much to the decline of Communist ideology there, it paradoxically offered a stage to Milošević and his allies from which to disseminate propaganda in an unrestrained manner across Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Another significant party in the new Bosnian multiparty environment was the Union of Reform Forces of Yugoslavia (SRSJ), popularly called the Reform Party, formed by the Yugoslav federal prime minister Ante Marković. The Bosnian president of the Reformists was Nenad Kecmanović, the rector of the University of Sarajevo. Both the Communists and the Reformists honored a multiethnic principle and opposed the division of the country, and during the election campaign polls showed that Duraković's Communists were running first, with the Marković-Kecmanović Reformists in close second place. But the polls were wrong. National parties ended up winning the first ever Bosnian democratic election, with grave consequences for the future of Bosnia.

The Party of Democratic Action (SDA) held a founding assembly on May 26, 1990, in Sarajevo. The party was formed by Alija Izetbegović with initial financial support from Adil Zulfikarpašić, a wealthy Muslim émigré living in Zurich. The two were to disagree on how to define and label the Muslim/Bosniak identity, a question that had burdened the nation since the Ottoman period. While Izetbegović believed it was unnecessary at that stage to confuse Bosnian Muslims with changes to the national name, Zulfikarpašić insisted that Muslims should begin calling themselves Bosniaks. On the surface, this was the reason Zulfikarpašić left the SDA during the election campaign and, together with the prominent Sarajevo professor Muhamed Filipović, formed the Muslim Bosniak Organization (MBO). Ostensibly, the split reflected differences in the two leaders' approaches—Zufikarpašić insisting on a more secular approach to the Muslim national question, and Izetbegović unwilling to give up on the importance of religion in the Muslim national identity—but it was also prompted by a power struggle over who was seen as the principal Bosnian Muslim/Bosniak leader.[6]

The Serbian Democratic Party was legally formed in July 1990, though its organization had begun a year earlier, in the summer of 1989. The party leader, Radovan Karadžić, was very clear from the beginning that Bosnian Serbs would not accept any kind of political arrangement that separated them from Serbs in Serbia and Croatia. Yet in his early public statements, for the sake of upcoming elections and the coalition of national parties, he maintained peaceful public rhetoric toward Bosnian Muslims, saying, "Serbs should not, in my assessment, be defenders of Christian Europe in the fight against Islam. We Serbs are much closer with our Muslims than with Europe, which does not see or recognize any of our vital needs. We have felt that in past wars and now, in peace, regarding the Kosovo issue."[7] But Karadžić's rhetoric toward Muslims was to change dramatically after the elections.

On August 18, 1990, the Croatian Democratic Union (HDZ) was formed in Sarajevo; based on the party's symbols and agenda, it was the clear offspring of Franjo Tuđman's HDZ. Pictures of President Tuđman and the Croatian flag were prominent, and the inaugural party meeting opened with the Croatian national anthem. Yet two opposing factions within the party were obvious from the very beginning. Though Bosnian HDZ leader Stjepan Kljujić was loyal to Tuđman, he did not share the Croatian leader's dismissive attitude toward Bosnian statehood and sovereignty; on the other hand, Mate Boban, who led the Herzegovinian wing of the party and who would later replace and marginalize Kljujić and his more moderate faction, strongly supported Tuđman's position regarding an independent Bosnia.[8]

A national coalition was formed in Bosnia after the November 1990 elections, but it was quickly challenged by the path Bosnia would take regarding its constitutional arrangement with Yugoslavia. While Muslim and Croat politicians were inclined toward the Slovenian and Croatian path—independence, or in the worst-case scenario, a confederation with Yugoslavia—Serb representatives were resolute about remaining part of a centralized, federal Yugoslavia.

Still, this was not an obstacle to the implementation of election results; power was divided among national parties, while the nonnational Left bloc became the opposition. Alija Izetbegović became president of the Presidency of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Momčilo Krajišnik of the SDS became president of the Assembly, and the HDZ's Jure Pelivan was named prime minister. Ministerial appointments took longer to agree on, so the process of government creation finally ended on January 30, 1991, more than two months after the elections were over.[9]

Less than five months later, on June 27, 1991, a self-declared Association of Municipalities in Bosnian and Croatian Krajina moved to unite with a newly declared Krajina region in Croatia. In proclaiming the union of the two Krajinas, the nationalist rhetoric of Serb leaders made no secret of their intentions to carve up the territories of Croatia and Bosnia in order to form a new Serbian polity. This move, a year before the war in Bosnia, was an obvious attempt to implement plans for a Greater Serbia, and was publicly advertised.[10]

The SDS was decisive that it should form Serb municipalities to secure control in all areas where Serbs were a majority. These attempts were focused on isolating such areas from the control of republic-level authorities in a process they called "regionalization." Mirko Pejanović, a former Bosnian Serb Communist, recalls a conversation he had with Radovan Karadžić as early as August 1990: "I noticed that Karadžić was very occupied with the problem of establishing Serbian municipalities. . . . I told him openly that he could achieve something like that only in municipalities where Serbs were an absolute majority, and that places like that in Bosnia were extremely rare. . . . I also told him that advocating this concept would sooner or later lead to a conflict among the people living in Bosnia and Herzegovina."[11]

The summer of 1991 was a period of intense Serbian military preparations. The JNA began to distribute weapons to areas with majority Serb populations via the SDS party structure. By the autumn of 1991, the deployment of Montenegrin reservists to JNA barracks in Mostar raised the tension further. These reservists terrorized the Muslim and Croat populations throughout Herzegovina, and in October 1991 they attacked the Bosnian Croat village of

Ravno, burning houses and killing villagers. Many in Bosnia, particularly Bosnian Croats, consider the JNA's attack on Ravno to be the start of the war.[12]

By the end of 1991, there was no longer any pretense that the Yugoslav Army was acting in the interests of any ethnic groups other than Serbs and Montenegrins. In his book, Milošević ally and member of the Federal Presidency Borisav Jović admitted that, on December 5, 1991, he and Milošević consulted with JNA commander Veljko Kadijević about reorganizing the army along ethnic lines. Soldiers of Bosnian and Herzegovinian descent were to be transferred to BiH, and this ethnic principle was to be applied across the JNA. Milošević openly told Kadijević to redeploy "all Bosnian Serbs to BiH,"[13] a request prompted by his assessment that Bosnia would soon make moves toward independence. Milošević wanted Bosnian Serbs to be ready for war.

On December 17, 1991, European Community foreign ministers cleared the road for Yugoslav republics to apply for independence. A commission, led by the French law professor Robert Badinter, was tasked with evaluating the applications of individual republics based on legal provisions and demonstrated respect for individual and minority rights. Only three days later, the Presidency of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina voted to apply for independence. SDS members in the Bosnian Presidency, Nikola Koljević and Biljana Plavšić, voted against the application.[14]

INDEPENDENCE AND GENOCIDAL THREAT

Two months before BiH applied to the Badinter Commission, in a dramatic session of Parliament that stretched through the night of October 14 and into the morning of October 15, Muslim and Croat parliamentarians—supported by the Left bloc, made up of former Communists who remained loyal to Bosnia—passed a resolution demanding sovereignty for Bosnia and Herzegovina. Serb nationalists left before the voting even started. The proceedings received wide television coverage, and before leaving Parliament, Karadžić stepped toward the microphone to issue the first open warning of genocide: "This road is the same highway of hell and suffering which Slovenia and Croatia took. Do not think that you will not take Bosnia and Herzegovina to hell, and maybe [to the] disappearance of the Muslim people, because Muslim people cannot defend themselves if war breaks out here."[15]

Documents that have come to light in proceedings of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY) show that Karadžić's speech in the Bosnian Parliament that day was not spontaneous but the result of brainstorming and careful planning that he had undertaken with close associates. A month before this public alert to the possible "disappearance of Muslim people," he had a conversation with Momčilo Krajišnik in which they discussed how to respond to the Muslim political plan for Bosnia's secession.[16] Mockingly, Karadžić proposed threatening, "Can you see where this leads? Do you realize you will disappear in this? . . . Man, you will disappear. Many of us will disappear, but you will be annihilated!" And just two days before his speech in Parliament, Karadžić spoke with another of his allies, Gojko Đogo, saying, "I think that they should be beaten if they start the war. . . . They will disappear . . . from the face of the earth." And three days later, after his impromptu speech, he told his brother in a telephone conversation that in the case of conflict, Muslims would face "a war until their obliteration." He added that "none of their leaders would stay alive. They would all be killed in three or four hours. They would not stand a chance."[17]

For Serbs in Bosnia, a declaration of independence inevitably meant war, a partition of the state, and the annihilation of Bosnian Muslims. The Bosnian leadership had to choose between being absorbed into Milošević's Greater Serbia or facing armed aggression. Bosnian Muslim leaders were accused of having had secessionist policies because they had entertained plans for independence, but as Hoare notes, "this charge ignores the fact that Bosnia-Herzegovina only declared sovereignty within Yugoslavia on October 14–15, 1991, over a year after Serbia had declared its independence within Yugoslavia on September 28, 1990; seven months after the Karađorđevo meeting of March 1991, at which Milošević and Tuđman discussed the partition of Bosnia-Herzegovina between them."[18]

At that meeting in Karađorđevo, held on March 25, the key agenda item was indeed the division of Bosnia and Herzegovina. By some accounts the Serbs asked for 66 percent of Bosnian territory and were willing to leave the rest to Croatia.[19] Dušan Bilandžić, adviser to Croatian president Tuđman and a member of the team that met for three rounds of negotiations to put the Karađorđevo deal together, recently testified that "the main aim of those negotiations, which were euphemistically called 'negotiations on normalization of Serbo-Croat relations,' was in fact the division of Bosnia and Herzegovina." Bilandžić said further that he tried to warn Tuđman that the international community would not accept the division of Bosnia, but Tuđman repeatedly dismissed his argument.[20] Apparently, Bilandžić met Bosnian president Izetbegović shortly after the negotiations began and asked him whether he knew about such plans. Izetbegović was reportedly not surprised and said he knew all about it.[21]

By the time the crisis in Bosnia was beginning to escalate, it was well known that Milošević was a skillful power player. But his Machiavellian peak was the war in Bosnia and preparations for it. Aware that the Croatians and Serbians were discussing the partition of their country, Bosniaks tried to forestall any Serbo-Croat plans by making their own deal with Milošević. The deal was negotiated through the Muslim Bosniak Organization, and it included the preservation of Bosnian independence in a common state with Serbia and Montenegro.[22] But when the organization's leaders came out publicly with the proposal, Izetbegović denied his support for it, deciding to pursue the path of independent statehood.

Bosnian Croats, represented by the Croatian Democratic Union (HDZ), were divided between a moderate faction led by party president Stjepan Kljujić, which held a vision for Bosnia that closely paralleled that of Bosnian Muslims, and a more extreme faction led by Mate Boban from Herzegovina, who was heavily influenced by leaders in Croatia. In January 1992, on Tuđman's order, Kljujić was replaced by Boban, who favored the division of Bosnia and the annexation of the "Croat part" to the Republic of Croatia. Bosnian Croat extremists, who were pressuring for a confederation with Croatia, objected that Izetbegović was not being decisive enough in his resistance to Milošević and the JNA. They argued that the aggression against Bosnia had started when the JNA attacked Ravno in October 1991, and they condemned Izetbegović for remaining passive.

Bosnia and Herzegovina was in a similar position to Macedonia, with heavy concentrations of the JNA on its territory. There was little hope that the international community would intervene if the JNA attacked, and so Bosnia and Herzegovina and Macedonia could hardly develop a viable political strategy or military resistance plan. As Banac reminds us, both Izetbegović and Kiro Gligorov had tried prior to the war to find a third way—they proposed a confederal state with Serbia and the already self-proclaimed independent republics of Slovenia and Croatia. But, "this was unrealistic: their position was absolutely hopeless at this point. . . . [They] did not try to complicate matters for Slovenia and Croatia, as is sometimes claimed. Their hands, especially Izetbegović's were tied."[23]

Secret negotiations by Bosnian Muslim and Croat political representatives with Milošević had planted the seeds of distrust between the two peoples, resulting in a wary alliance. While the Bosnian Army and Croat forces engaged in fighting in some areas, their alliance against Serbian aggression nonetheless held together during 1992 and early 1993. The Bosnian Army and population depended on supply lines from Croatia for weapons and food. In 1993, after the Bosnian government and Bosnian Croats led by Mate Boban accepted the Vance-Owen peace plan, this uneasy alliance disintegrated into a full-blown war. Though the Serbs did not endorse the peace plan because it included a clause on the right of refugees to return, it was a sign that the international community was ready for the partition of Bosnia along ethnic lines.

According to the Vance-Owen plan, Bosnia and Herzegovina would become a grouping of autonomous provinces, or cantons, each with almost all the functions of government, including policing. The central government would be authorized only to deal with foreign affairs. But the reason the plan was an incentive for war between Croat forces and the Bosnian Army is that the Vance-Owen map labeled provinces exclusively by ethnic labels; in addition, it was not very precise, so that the ethnic boundaries were still not clear. It is fair to say that the authors of this map were partly responsible for inciting the conflict in central Bosnia, which had a mixed Bosniak and Croat population. After many civilian losses, the war between Croatia and Bosnia was ended with the direct involvement of the United States in March 1994.[24]

Had the partnership between Bosnian Muslims and Bosnian Croats been stronger prior to the war, and had the United States and the European Community been more proactive in supporting it, Milošević's room for maneuver would have been considerably more restricted, and the Bosnian resistance movement much stronger. But as it was, Milošević and his Bosnian Serb collaborationists faced no obstacles in turning Bosnia into a killing field. In fact, their response to the Bosnian resolution on independence was to expedite preparations for aggression, following an already well-conceived plan. This plan depended on Serbian forces, which had an overwhelming military superiority, and which committed most of the crimes against non-Serb civilians in Bosnia as well as the genocide against Bosnian Muslims. The ensuing analysis attempts to deconstruct the way in which these forces and this plan were prepared and put into action. Further, the argument put forth in this book is that genocide began in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the spring of 1992, as opposed to occurring only as an isolated incident in July 1995 in Srebrenica. Justification for this broader conception of genocide in the war in Bosnia is illustrated by the case studies of seven municipalities in eastern Bosnia presented in chapter 4.

THE SERBIAN PLAN OF AGGRESSION

Immediately after the resolution on independence was passed by the Bosnian Parliament on October 15, 1991, the SDS leaders met to discuss the next steps they needed to take to achieve the homogenization of Serb people and territories. Atop the agenda were the issues of forming a separate Bosnian Serb assembly and holding a plebiscite exclusively for Serbs, to determine whether they wished to remain in Yugoslavia. A plan was developed to speed up the process of "regionalization," and to form parallel organs of authority—essentially, to organize a Bosnian Serb para-state within the confines of Bosnia and Herzegovina.[25]

The "SAO-ization" (the division of territory into self-proclaimed Serb Autonomous Regions) of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, orchestrated by SDS leaders, had begun in September 1991; but beginning in mid-October, these efforts were intensified along with moves to develop Serb administrative, political, and paramilitary institutions and formations in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Assembly of the Serb People of Bosnia and Herzegovina was established on October 24, 1991, and only two weeks later, on November 9 and 10, 1991, Bosnian Serbs voted in a plebiscite to remain a part of Yugoslavia. A decision rendered by the Assembly on November 21, 1991, declared that those municipalities in which Serbs voted—even where they were a minority—would remain an integral part of Yugoslavian territory. Accordingly, Serb municipal bodies were established throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina.[26]

In response to the December 20, 1991, majority vote in the Bosnian and Herzegovinian Presidency that endorsed applying for independence through the Badinter Commission, the self-styled Serb Assembly met the next day to approve preparations for the formation of a "Serbian Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina." Yet precise instructions for the organization of parallel Serb institutions in municipalities throughout the country, along with obvious war preparations, had been issued the day *before* the Bosnian Presidency vote.

On December 19, 1991, the Main Board of the SDS had approved secret instructions, in two versions, and sent them to the municipal SDS headquarters.[27] Version A was concerned with the municipalities in which Serbs were the majority. If this version is read carefully, it is obvious that ethnic division of the state was seen as only a temporary solution, with ultimate plans to fully occupy Bosnia and Herzegovina. This complex set of instructions covered all stages of the preparation for war—from the creation of duty rosters in municipalities, to the establishment of crisis headquarters, to the designation of municipal-level Serb assemblies. Serbs were advised not to use vacation leaves or to travel abroad, presumably so that they would be available to take up arms when called upon. A plan for the reinforcement of war units of "JNA classes" and the "securing of continuous production and services of vital interest for defense, resistance and life of [the] Serb people" was also outlined.

Version B—the plan for municipalities in which Serbs were a minority—was slightly different. Serb assemblies were also to be created in these municipalities, but unlike in places where Serbs were the majority, these assemblies had to exist in concert with legal, multiethnic municipal assemblies; so directions were to prepare, but not fully implement, these plans. The order was also given to establish secret storage and supply dumps, and to fill them with food and other needed provisions. As for other types of supplies, the directive was to "bring them out through secret channels." This was, practically, a demand to plunder state property and the private property of non-Serb civilians. Version B also gave particular emphasis to more intense propaganda activities.[28]

The activities of the SDS in December 1991 were a continuation of clandestine preparations of the Serb population for war that had started as early as August of that year, when Karadžić had issued an order that "all municipal and regional committees of [the] SDS in Bosnia and Herzegovina are directly instructed to use secret, encoded communication as of August 1991."[29] For example, the code for the Breza Municipality head was Lipa-126, and Karadžić's was Vidra-126. The fact that Serbs were already using encoded communication within the SDS in August 1991 implies that specific political and military preparations had started almost a year before widespread aggression broke out.

Also in August 1991, Karadžić issued "Guidelines for all municipal and regional committees of [the] SDS in BiH."[30] The guidelines ordered municipal committees to work in secret with local committees to appoint one person in each local committee who would keep "ten to twenty houses on alert." Serbs were being organized to react quickly to calls for mobilization. For a year before the war began, throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina this preparation was concealed from Bosnian Muslim and Croat neighbors. This approach corresponds with war preparations based on the creation of "cells," and speaks more generally to the unified enlistment of the Serb population. By the end of December 1991, municipal-level crisis headquarters were established.

These crisis headquarters were networked with the Assembly of the Serb People and the SDS Central Committee. According to the instructions issued by Karadžić, each crisis headquarters was run by the president of the SDS Municipal Committee, who also served as the president of the municipal assembly in a majority of the municipalities encompassed by Version A. The crisis headquarters were also linked to the SDS leadership and those associated with the party's core: the Secretariat of each SDS Municipal Committee,[31] municipal delegates in the Assembly of Bosnian Serbs, and members of the SDS Central Committee from each respective municipality.[32]

Crisis headquarters further encompassed all high-ranking SDS members within Serb quasi-governmental bodies. Of particular note is the fact that crisis headquarters were ordered to cooperate with the commanders and headquarters of the JNA. Proof of the establishment of these regional crisis headquarters appeared as early as February 1992, when "Level 2" of the instructions was launched.[33] According to documentation available at the ICTY, municipal crisis headquarters were in direct communication not only with the SDS Central Committee and the Assembly but also with Radovan Karadžić and his closest associates, Momčilo Krajišnik and Biljana Plavšić.[34] Although crisis headquarters had been operational before the fourteenth session of the Assembly of Bosnian Serbs, Karadžić gave precise instructions during that session that delegates were to establish crisis headquarters immediately upon return to their respective municipalities. He stressed that members of crisis headquarters had to be reserve military officers.[35] On April 26, 1992, with the aggression already escalating and the siege of Sarajevo beginning, the self-proclaimed Republic of the Serb People of Bosnia and Herzegovina adopted "Instructions for the operations of Serb crisis headquarters in municipalities," whereby crisis headquarters were ordered to assume the responsibilities of the municipal assemblies whenever the assemblies were prevented from convening: "The Crisis Staff coordinates functions of authorities with the objective of defending the territory, securing the safety [of people and property], establishing the authority and organizing areas of life and work. The Crisis Staff must act in accordance with constitutional and legal provisions as well as decisions of the Municipal Assembly, the Presidency and Government of the Serbian Republic of BH. . . . The Crisis Staff is obliged to collect information on conditions in the field. . . . The Crisis Staff shall submit weekly reports to the regional and state bodies of the Serbian Republic of BH."[36]

Other official documents point further to the fact that the Bosnian Serb leadership considered these crisis headquarters to be the most efficient mechanisms with which to establish control over the occupied territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and that both the military and the civil sectors of their collaborationist quasi-institutions were consolidated through the crisis headquarters. Thus, the crisis headquarters played an active role in the planning and execution of genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes against Bosniaks, Croats, and other Bosnian citizens who did not support the Serb quasi-state. Since the term "crisis headquarters" connotes a secret, reactive body, the Bosnian Serb leadership decided to rename the crisis headquarters to "war presidencies" and "war committees." In practice, however, local Serb authorities continued to use the terms "war headquarters" and "war presidencies" interchangeably, while the term "crisis headquarters" remained occasionally in use until July 1992.[37] But any difference between the terms is essentially artificial. The use of multiple terms was simply an attempt by Serb leaders to legitimize the creation of a quisling entity of Bosnian Serbs built on ideals that could not be achieved without criminal acts. Regardless of whether we call them crisis headquarters, war presidencies, or war committees, the fact is that these para-statal bodies ensured that the genocidal politics of the SDS and the so-called Bosnian Serb government were implemented through coordinated actions of the police, the military, and paramilitary forces.

The Republic of the Serb People of Bosnia and Herzegovina was proclaimed on January 9, 1992 (and was renamed Republika Srpska eight months later).[38] In March, a series of decisions were made to further prepare for aggression against Bosnia and Herzegovina. In the Official Gazette of Serb People, "decrees" on the promulgation of laws on internal affairs, public information, and national defense were published.[39] Article 18 of the Law on National Defense states that "citizens, pursuant to Federal Law, have a right and obligation to perform their military, work and material duties, to take part in civil protection activities and be trained for national defense." Article 29 reads: "Companies and other legal entities shall be obliged to provide, at the request of the ministry, objects and services of a particular importance for defense."[40] It is obvious that the collaborationist role of the SDS was in alignment with an aggression and not an uncontrolled civil war, a characterization that was erroneously made by many outside the country and was promoted by Serbs.

On February 28, 1992, the Assembly of Bosnian Serbs adopted a decision to proclaim the constitution of the (so-called) Republic of the Serb People. The first draft described a Serb state that included non-Serbs. Eventually, it was amended, and by late 1992 the Serb Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina was defined in effect as a state of Serbs only. About this change, Dr. James Gow testified as an expert witness at the ICTY: "I think that by the time the Republika Srpska constitution was promulgated at the end of 1992, to some extent, it's also a reflection of the *de facto* reality on the ground, which is that the overwhelming majority of the non-Serb population . . . [was in] one way or another removed from that territory." When asked by the ICTY prosecutor if the Serb constitution could "be considered as one of the foundations" for a policy of ethnic cleansing, Gow replied that it was "certainly part of that program of activity."[41]

That program of activity and the measures described above were designed within the wider context of a war plan known simply as "RAM" (which means "the frame," a reference to "reframing the borders of Yugoslavia"). A functional extension of the SANU memorandum, RAM had existed since at least early 1991; it outlined plans to achieve a Yugoslavia without Slovenia, and to conquer the territories of Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. On September 23, 1991, the magazine *Vreme* (Time) wrote that Ante Marković, the last prime minister of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY), had warned about the existence of the RAM plan in a September 18th session of the Federal Executive Council. Marković had knowledge of its existence from conversations intercepted by the council, and he asserted that, in one of those conversations, Slobodan Milošević ordered Radovan Karadžić to make contact with JNA general Nikola Uzelac, commander of the Banja Luka Corps, in order to arm Krajina's Territorial Defense and implement RAM.[42] This intercepted conversation was played in the ICTY courtroom on November 22, 2002. In it, Milošević hinted that there were things he couldn't say on the phone, but he told Karadžić, "It is of strategic importance for RAM; do you know what RAM is?" To which Karadžić conspiringly replied, "Yes, I know, I know everything."[43]

According to witnesses, RAM originated in the top circles of Serb operatives of the Yugoslav counterintelligence service. It involved the development of a network of secret operatives whose aim was to arm Serbs in Croatia and Bosnia and to prepare them for war. The RAM plan was presented as evidence in The Hague to prove that Slobodan Milošević had a clear and developed scheme to purge non-Serbs from territories he aimed to conquer in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. Croats from Croatia as well as Bosnian Croats were targeted along with Bosnian Muslims, as they stood in the way of Serb expansionism in territories encompassed by RAM.

Witness Milan Babić, the former president of the self-proclaimed Republic of Serbian Krajina, confirmed the existence of a genocidal plan during the Milošević trial.[44] His testimony reiterated his firsthand recollection of Karadžić's plans, from July 1991, to expel Bosnian Muslims to the river valleys and connect all Serb territories in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Back then, Milošević had warned Babić not to "stand in Radovan's way."[45] Milošević had instructed Karadžić and Babić to publicly maintain their loyalty to Yugoslavia, rather than to Serbia, in order to conceal the true aim of creating a Greater Serbia. And this rhetoric was effective in influencing international community officials, who were quick to accept Milošević's "party line" at face value because it validated their own passivity. Geoffrey Nice, the lead prosecutor in the Milošević case, presented numerous exhibits during the Milošević trial that illustrated how the Yugoslav ideal had been manipulated for this cause. On December 30, 1991, Milošević warned Karadžić over the telephone to always talk in terms of continuity with the old Yugoslavia, reminding him to "be careful . . . don't let them comprehend [the] creation of something new."[46]

INDEPENDENCE AND WAR

The Bosnian and Herzegovinian referendum on independence—held on February 29 and March 1, 1992—was boycotted by a majority of Serbs, on the instruction of the SDS. Still, some Serbs living in multiethnic urban areas did take part. Voter turnout was 63.6 percent, and 99.7 percent of voters supported Bosnian independence. In response to the referendum results, the SDS erected barricades around the city of Sarajevo. Sarajevans reacted with mass peaceful demonstrations, and following on this momentum, the Social Democratic Party organized speakers in front of the Bosnian Parliament who pleaded with the JNA to stop the war and the partition of the country; but these were pleas made to an army that already had its heavy artillery distributed across the hills surrounding Sarajevo.

The March crisis did end shortly thereafter, through the intervention of General Milutin Kukanjac, the JNA commander in Sarajevo, and the barricades were removed.[47] But full-blown war was to start a month later, on April 6, 1992—the day the international community recognized Bosnian independence. As Serb forces and JNA artillery began shelling the outskirts of Sarajevo, Sarajevans again gathered outside the Parliament building, where they naively applauded as JNA tanks passed by; these peaceful protesters failed to comprehend that the JNA had already become a Serb army. And those Serb army forces would hold the city for three and a half years in a monstrous siege, in which 11,541 people—many of them children—lost their lives. As Serb gunmen opened fire from the nearby Holiday Inn onto civilians protesting for peace outside the Parliament that day, JNA tanks and troops took control of Sarajevo's international airport. On April 7, two members of the Bosnian Serb Presidency, Biljana Plavšić and Nikola Koljević, left Sarajevo along with Radovan Karadžić and the rest of the Bosnian Serb leadership. They established their headquarters in Pale, on a hill above Sarajevo. From there, they had a good view of the city as they plagued and tormented its citizens over the years to come.[48]

The siege of Sarajevo dominated international discourse of the Bosnian War, largely because it was the focus of a bulk of global media coverage about the conflict. The presence of international journalists there, who rarely traveled through the rest of occupied Bosnia, diverted attention from the genocide that began elsewhere in Bosnia even before the assault on Sarajevo. As Gow put it, "Sarajevo became a celebrity city—known everywhere for its predicament and visited by international celebrities seeking to show solidarity with the beleaguered inhabitants."[49]

Between March and May 1992, the JNA and other coordinated Serbian and Bosnian Serb forces (more on their coordination below) launched coordinated attacks to secure the main entry points into Bosnia, and also to take over major communication lines and establish logistical corridors. A short timeline of the attacks on and occupations of towns of eastern and northwestern Bosnia illustrates how coordinated and well prepared these forces were: Bosanski Brod on March

27, Bijeljina on April 2, Kupres on April 4, Foča and Zvornik on April 8, Višegrad on April 13, Bosanski Šamac on April 17, Vlasenica on April 18, and Brčko and Prijedor on April 30. Gow, who also refers to rumors that the RAM plan existed well before the occupation, concludes that the reality of these attacks reflects what was at the heart of that plan: "Incontestably, these initial operations to ensure control of access into and out of Bosnia established a frame around the periphery of the country, within which the remainder of the campaign was conducted."[50]

Fighting back this well-prepared aggression without the help of the international community was an impossible task; Bosnian government forces had neither heavy artillery nor an organized army. As Robert Donia has noted, the JNA and Serb forces faced little to no resistance in those April and May offensives. "In mid-April and May, JNA troops aided by local Serb leaders seized key towns along the Sava River on BiH's northern boundary with Croatia. Serbian forces encircled Sarajevo and several key towns in Eastern Bosnia and fought for the city of Mostar in Herzegovina. By early May, large parts of BiH were under Serbian military control."[51] The occupation of cities and villages throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina was not purely a matter of seizing territory; this strategy was aimed against civilians, to create fear among the population and to alter future demographics. The expulsion and extermination of non-Serbs, the establishment of concentration camps, and the destruction of non-Serb cultural and religious monuments were strategies of war meant to insure that any non-Serbs who survived this horror would never wish to return to the territories they had inhabited before the war.

GENOCIDAL RHETORIC: MEDIA AND PARLIAMENTARIANS

The focus of the ICTY on detaching individual guilt from collective responsibility, coupled with the issuance of inconsistent indictments by both the tribunal and the state court, have provided grounds for denial by current Republika Srpska (RS) leadership of their predecessors' political responsibility for genocide. A judgment rendered by the International Court of Justice (ICJ), however, directly attributed responsibility for acts of genocide committed in Srebrenica to RS institutions; but it also found that the JNA had been involved in military operations in eastern Bosnia that were launched well before that tragedy took place. According to the judgment, Republika Srpska did maintain de facto control of much territory and the loyalty of many Bosnian Serbs despite the fact that it never gained international, legal recognition.[52] While the court laid political and military responsibility for genocide in Srebrenica at the feet of RS leaders, who it claimed could not be proven to be "state organs" acting on behalf of Serbia, the ICJ judgment did not let Belgrade off the hook completely, saying: "There is no doubt that the FRY [Federal Republic of Yugoslavia] was providing substantial support . . . to the Republika Srpska" and, later, that "substantial aid of a political, military, and financial nature provided by the FRY to the Republika Srpska and the VRS [Army of Republika Srpska] beginning long before the tragic events of Srebrenica, continued during those events. There is thus little doubt that the atrocities in Srebrenica were committed, at least in part, with the resources which the perpetrators of those acts possessed as a result of the general policy of aid and assistance pursued toward them by the FRY."[53] The judgment reinforces that the crime of genocide cannot be committed by individuals alone; the individuals must have the support of a criminal state and/or of quasi-state institutions.

It is not uncommon, through the filter of individual responsibility that has been put forth by international institutions, to hear that the blame for mass atrocities during the war in Bosnia falls squarely on the shoulders of Slobodan Milošević, Ratko Mladić, and Radovan Karadžić, all of whom were charged with planning and implementing genocide against Bosniaks. This chapter offers a number of examples that buttress the argument that genocide is a process that cannot be implemented by only several individuals but at the time it is committed genocidal intent is shared and perpetuated by all those in power. Chapter 2 illustrates how aggressive propaganda can polarize a population and lead one "side" to comply with the idea of genocide, and even to participate in genocide. To implement a genocidal process, however, the idea of it must be made acceptable through political discourse. "Genocidal rhetoric" therefore emerges; this extreme model of hate speech always exists in state or quasi-state institutions that carry out genocide.

As Bosnian Serb political leaders moved their headquarters from Sarajevo to Pale on April 7, 1992, Bosnian television also started splitting along ethnic lines. A number of Bosnian Serb journalists stayed and worked in the city throughout the siege, but by the summer of 1992, many of them had left to join the newly established Serbian Radio and TV in Pale. Not surprisingly, their editorial policy was to portray the occupation of cities, and the massacres and expulsions of non-Serb civilians, as "liberation." What was shocking was the language and imagery these journalists used to encourage hatred against non-Serbs, particularly against Bosnian Muslims. Former Sarajevo journalist Risto Đogo was famous for his outbursts of disgust and hatred toward Bosniaks. "People who watched his Journal day in and day out remember him sporting a long knife and saying, 'And this is what we have for our former neighbors, the *Balije*' [a derogatory term for Muslims]. He would keep his bare feet in a pan of water, ridiculing a Muslim ritual before prayer. . . . On the occasion of the massacres of civilians in the Sarajevo marketplace in February 1994, he finished his report by lying on the studio floor beneath the editorial desk, posing as a fake victim of shelling and exhibiting a traditional Serb three-finger salute as a symbol of 'Serb victory.' "[54]

When there was still electricity in the besieged city, many Sarajevans watched Risto Đogo each evening. Journalist Gojko Berić still struggles to explain why people watched hate propaganda aimed to demoralize them: "People were waiting for Đogo's evening Journal, like in some masochistic ritual, expecting to see how low it could get. In the beginning, there was still some disbelief that the war—with the killing of people in their homes, in the streets and parks, with Đogo and the evil he represented—would last long. But later it became almost a need to see what kind of people were behind all that terror. I think that Đogo's primitive hatred produced unintended reactions among the Sarajevans—defiance and superiority against evil—and I believe that, in the end, it contributed to the survival of the city."[55]

Đogo was a leader in hate-mongering propaganda, but most Serb journalists working in the Bosnian occupied territories followed the same line of reporting, employing explicit genocidal rhetoric. And transcripts of the Republika Srpska Assembly from 1992 through 1995 reveal that assembly delegates also shared Đogo's opinion of Bosnian Muslims. American professor of history Robert Donia analyzed RS Assembly transcripts during his expert witness testimony at the ICTY in the Milošević trial. His report proves the existence of genocidal rhetoric in Bosnian Serb political discourse, thus expanding the scope of accountability for the genocide in Bosnia from individuals to institutions.

On May 12, 1992, Radovan Karadžić outlined Six Strategic Goals for the Serb people in the sixteenth session of the Bosnian Serb Assembly. According to Donia, these goals "serve[d] as a guide for the SDS and RS for the next four years." They were to:

1) separate Serbs from the other two national (ethnic) communities;
2) establish a corridor between Semberija and Krajina;
3) establish a Drina valley corridor, thereby eliminating the Drina River as a border between Serb states;
4) establish a border on the Una and Neretva rivers;
5) divide Sarajevo into Serbian and Muslim parts;
6) ensure access to the sea for the Republic of the Serb People of Bosnia and Herzegovina.[56]

By the time these goals were announced, the aggression was well under way and some of them had already been achieved. After more than one parliamentarian in attendance enthusiastically showed support for Karadžić, General Ratko Mladić took the floor and, in lay terms, explained that these goals could not be attained without genocide, since "people . . . are not pawns nor are they keys in one's pocket that can be shifted from here to there."[57] It was apparently clear to Mladić at that early date that the plan envisaged by the Serb political leadership could not be put into practice without the forced elimination of Bosnian Muslims. If they hadn't grasped it before, Serb military and political leaders couldn't help but become aware of the likely consequences of their actions once Mladić had spoken.[58] And Mladić seemed to accept genocide as enough of a likelihood that he sought to raise awareness of the international dimension of genocide among his colleagues: "We have to put a ring around the dragon's head of Sarajevo this very moment, and only those whom we let out should be allowed out. . . . We mustn't say that we are going to destroy Sarajevo. No, we will not. We want to preserve Sarajevo, we need Sarajevo. We are not going to say that we are going to destroy the power supply pylons or turn off the water supply, no, because that would get America out if its seat, but . . . well, one day there is no water at all in Sarajevo. . . . We have to wisely tell the world, it was they who were shooting, hit the transmission line and the power went off, they were shooting at the water supply facilities . . . [and] we are doing our best to repair this, that is what diplomacy is."[59]

From the very beginning of the aggression and genocide, Mladić realized that misrepresentation of reality and avoidance of any public acceptance for the responsibility of crimes was necessary in order to prevent military intervention by the international community. Heated discussion on the fate Bosnian Muslims continued, and in the RS Assembly's seventeenth session, held two months later, Karadžić further rationalized his own genocidal intentions. He explained that Serbs could not live "in a unified state" with Muslims and said further that "Europe does not desire and not dare allow the creation of an Islamic state. . . . They want us and the Croats to remain in a unified Bosnia so that we can control the Muslims." This was one of a number of statements Karadžić made to the Assembly over time that indicated he felt Europe had given him the green light for genocide. He told the delegates: "We well know, where fundamentalism arrives, you cannot live anymore. There's no tolerance. By means of a high birth rate, [Muslims] have increased four times, and we Serbs have not increased, nor did the Christians in Lebanon increase because they lacked that Oriental mentality that Islam bestows. Serbs and Croats together by birth rate cannot control the intrusion of Islam into Europe, for in 5–6 years, in a unified Bosnia, the Muslims would be over 51 percent. So if [Europe does] not want any kind of Islamic state in the Balkans, they will be even less likely to want a pure Islamic state, an Islamic canton, a Muslim canton on Bosnian territory. . . . This conflict was incited so that the Muslims would not exist."[60]

Exhilarated by this genocidal rhetoric, delegate Srdo Srdić from Prijedor emphasized his municipality's role in the genocidal process, boasting: "We didn't ask [Bosnian Serb leaders] what we should do in Prijedor. Prijedor was the single 'green' municipality in Bosnian Krajina, and if we had listened to you, we would still be green today. . . . We fixed them and sent them packing."[61] Srdić's reference to being a "green" municipality refers to maps drawn of the 1990 elections, on which wins by the SDA—the Bosniak nationalist party—were indicated in green. Krajina, in the northwest of Bosnia, had been largely won by the SDS, the Serb nationalist party, but Prijedor was an exception. Srdić is bragging, in other words, about having transformed the municipality from a Bosniak majority in 1990 to a Serb majority two years later.

The delegates to the Assembly seemed to be competing to achieve the greatest cleansing of Bosniaks. At the twenty-fourth session, held on January 8, 1993, General Mladić reported that the VRS had stopped a UNPROFOR vehicle carrying Bosnian vice president Hakija Turajlić. The delegates applauded when he told the Assembly that "our guys stopped the vehicle and searched them. One of our soldiers killed Turajlić with six bullets."[62]

At the thirty-fourth session, the longest wartime session, held from August 27 through October 1, 1993, one of the main topics of discussion was the latest peace proposal, the Owen-Stoltenberg plan. Referred to as the Union of Three Republics, the plan created three ethnic mini-states within the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina, awarding the largest mini-state by far to the Serbs. But despite Karadžić's assertion that the plan fulfilled his Six Strategic Goals, Bosanska Krupa delegate Miroslav Vještica argued that it allowed for Muslim refugees to return to his municipality; a problem, Vještica explained, because "we will have to compensate for everything we destroyed and burned and the seventeen mosques that we flattened."[63]

War rhetoric was not only prevalent but dominant in the Republika Srpska Assembly, and is evident in a statement made by Milorad Dodik on October 15, 1995, in Banja Luka, just months before the war ended. Any criticism he expresses is related only to tactical, not genocidal, implications. According to Dodik, "the establishment of the peace process and cease-fire were catastrophic for the RS. . . . And the greatest mistake of the war was Srebrenica and Žepa," for which, he said, "someone has to take responsibility. . . . Who is responsible? We legalized before the international community that a safe area can be taken, and then five days later clamored when the protected area of Republika Srpska

Krajina was attacked, something we ourselves had done only five days before. We lost the position which we could have defended."[64]

Dodik was concerned not about war crimes committed against Bosniaks but rather about the fact that the Serbs had weakened their position in negotiations. The assembly session in which this statement was made was held when the trail of destruction left in Bosnian towns by Serb army forces was widely known. In fact, Radovan Karadžić, reflecting on Srebrenica, said the following at the time: "As Supreme Commander, I stood behind plans for Žepa and Srebrenica, mainly for Srebrenica. Žepa was understood. Gentlemen, we would have lost the war had Žepa, with 90,000 armed Muslims, continued to exist. I personally looked over the plans without the knowledge of the General Staff, not intentionally but by coincidence, found General Krstić, and advised him to go into the city and proclaim the fall of Srebrenica, and after that . . . chase the Turks through the woods. I approved that radical mission, and I feel no remorse."[65]

It is significant that no one in the Bosnian Serb Assembly during this session disagreed with or questioned Karadžić's statements, in which he essentially admitted to having approved a "radical mission" that resulted in genocide. As parliamentary members who had just heard a public admission of genocide, those present in the Assembly had the responsibility to ask questions and demand accountability, as well as to intiate legal procedeengs for grave breaches of the Geneva Convention. After all, that is the duty of all parliamentarians in all "civilized" countries in the world. But that was not the choice made by members of the Assembly; and their silence makes them accomplices and coconspirators.

TRANSFORMATION OF THE YUGOSLAV PEOPLE'S ARMY

In November 1991, Radovan Karadžić had addressed Serbs with regard to the October plebiscite.[66] Essentially, he announced a coming war at that time, months before the aggression began, and proposed that all journalists disloyal to the SDS be dismissed. He ordered that the Public Accounting Services be appropriated and that all prominent entrepreneurs be recruited by the SDS if they were not already members. Predicting the conflict, Karadžić said, "In BiH alone, almost half a million soldiers could be mobilized and armed with light and heavy weapons. No one could oppose that. I am telling those foreigners that a war would be bloody and rough. Whether it would be long, I don't know. But it would be bloody and rough for sure and many things would be decided and solved by it."[67]

Karadžić also informed the Serb Assembly that he had talked to members of the army leadership. He claimed to have shown them a map, telling them that they could sleep peacefully in all the areas marked with blue. These were areas where Serbs had already consolidated their power, and where the Serb-dominated JNA had full control.[68] As for the JNA, Karadžić optimistically informed the Assembly that the Serbs needed no army of their own, as they already had the JNA.[69]

The defense system of the SFRY had consisted of the Yugoslav People's Army (JNA) and republic-based Territorial Defense (TO) units, akin to military reserve forces in other countries. While the JNA was the core of a unified armed force, the TO units prepared and trained civilian troops for participation in armed combat.[70] Essentially an organized paramilitary force, the TO system had developed out of the World War II Partisan tradition of guerrilla resistance. The Federal Secretariat for National Defense administered the TO forces; however, the command structures of the JNA were decentralized and thereby the republic-level Secretariats for National Defense were in direct charge of their own TO units.

Dr. James Gow, testifying as an expert witness at the ICTY regarding the JNA and TO defense system, graphically described the role of Serb TO forces in the genocide against Bosniaks. Gow highlights the function of the JNA as the first of a two-tier defense system. During the aggression against Bosnia and Herzegovina, the JNA redirected its tactics from those meant to address an external enemy to those that would achieve the internal goal of genocide against Bosniaks. Such operations required the mobilization of a majority of the Serb population in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and necessitated having specific plans in place should the aggression be launched. Gow explained that "there was an assumption that the whole of the population in some way would be mobilized either as part of the Territorial Defense or as what was called civil defense."[71]

Until 1982 and the adoption of the Law on General National Defense, which was followed soon after by adoption of the 1983 Armed Combat Strategy, armed forces in Yugoslavia were intended for defense against an external aggressor only. For the first time, these two documents "mentioned extraordinary circumstances. This notion officially appeared in the SFRY in the [19]80s . . . right after death of the supreme commander [Josip Broz], and it was a foundation for introduction of [claims of] extraordinary circumstances in a part of SFRY territory or in the entire country."[72]

The SFRY Armed Forces were designed in such a way as to make the JNA and TO a uniform system. Their operational strategy was based on defense against aggression from outside Yugoslav borders. According to this strategy, the JNA responded first to aggression and provided time to mobilize TO (guerrilla) forces. The TO units would then, together with the JNA elements, organize a comprehensive and united defense.[73] Thus, until the adoption of these documents in 1982 and 1983, JNA tactical plans did not anticipate the use of the armed forces in the case of internal emergency or unrest. But the possibility that JNA forces could be deployed in the event of such an internal crisis was reiterated in the 1987 "Strategy of General National Defense and Social Self-Defense of the SFRY." This document defined an internal emergency rather broadly, leaving open the possibility for legislative manipulation and misuse of armed forces. These changes to the constitutional authorities of the armed forces were due to unrest in Kosovo, defined by the League of Communists as "counterrevolutionary" activities. The members of the Communist elite of the time were predominantly Serb, and since the 1974 constitution had reduced the powers of the Republic of Serbia over its two autonomous provinces, of which Kosovo was one, Serb elites had slowly begun to abandon party policy that condemned nationalist rhetoric. When Kosovar Serbs demonstrated around claims of mistreatment by the ethnic Albanian majority, Serb party leaders took advantage of the situation to shift the balance of power within Yugoslav federalism.

Serb nationalism spread within Communist structures through propaganda aimed at convincing the Serbs that they needed to defend themselves against potential statelessness.[74] Serb nationalism and pretensions of Serb hegemony were the key causes of divisions within the SFRY. While Slovenian, Croatian, and Bosnian and Herzegovinian nationalism included plans for peaceful dissolution, Serb nationalism had echoed of war ever since its recrudescence. It has been repeatedly true throughout history that when an army's leadership is disoriented and frantic—as occurred in the JNA upon the death of Tito—there is a greater tendency to accept extreme ideologies and seek aggressive leaders who will restore security. For JNA officers and generals, this meant the preservation of the military structure as they knew it. There is much proof that preparations for rapid transformation of the JNA into a Serbian Army, which was expedited after its attacks on Slovenia and Croatia, had been brewing for a long time. It was expected that the JNA would, for several reasons, have been most inclined toward a political option which laid significant power in the lap of the military. As Smail Čekić points out, "This ha[d] become particularly evident . . . after Tito's death, when the army leadership, politically more independent and supported by a powerful military-industrial complex, launched the initiative to change the 1974 Constitution and started discussions on changing the concept of general national defense and launched the slogan: the JNA is the 'seventh republic,' calling upon its special responsibility in the destiny of Yugoslavia."[75]

In order to extract the military establishment from the country's management and command system, the JNA was restructured. Without any public discussion and relying upon authorizations guaranteed by the 1974 constitution, the JNA replaced old army districts—the borders of which mainly corresponded to those of the republics—with new ones.[76] By the mid-1980s, the army had become a key political factor, one that participated at first in preparations to maintain Yugoslavia by force and then for "the realization of the Greater Serbia project."[77] Reforms initiated by Admiral Branko Mamula practically revoked the republic-based parameters of the TO forces, returning the JNA to a level of centralization not seen since the 1960s.[78] New commands of these military districts were given more authority than just the supervision of republic-level management, crucial for the JNA to take part in aggression against the republics themselves. In other words, the JNA positioned itself to fight against those whom its long-standing strategy had been created to protect. This restructuring of the JNA was a sign that the military and political leadership from Belgrade wished to intentionally weaken the TO system. At the same time, Belgrade secretly worked to establish and arm Serb TO units that, at the beginning of the JNA's aggression against Bosnia and Herzegovina, played the role of collaborationist forces.

THE ARMY, THE POLICE, AND SPECIAL AND "PARAMILITARY" FORCES

All earlier historical examples of genocide have shown that the army and police are key agents for its implementation; those who plan genocides are well aware of this. For the Germans to commit genocide in World War II, it was necessary to engage all available military, special forces, and police, from the Wehrmacht to the SS to the Gestapo. The Holocaust did not consist only of murder in concentration camps but was carried out through the mass execution of Jews who, for instance, found themselves in areas of the Soviet Union surrounded by Wehrmacht soldiers.[79] A comparison of dictators throughout history, including Adolf Hitler and Slobodan Milošević, makes clear that their dictatorships have required the full support of their respective militaries. Given the humiliating position the German Army found itself in after World War I, and Hitler's promises to revive it, it is easy to understand why Hitler garnered such military backing. The armies of both Germany and Yugoslavia traditionally depended on the support of strong political authorities. The kaiser in Germany and Tito in Yugoslavia were authoritarian leaders and the supreme commanders of respectable fighting forces. After the kaiser's abdication and Tito's death, both armies were disoriented and left to face insecure futures. In the case of Yugoslavia, Tito's passing led to disturbances in the command structure. In a system of collective presidency with representatives from all the

Yugoslav republics and autonomous territories, Tito had been "president for life" and head of state; but upon his death, the remaining members of the leadership began an annual rotation as chairman of the Presidency—the position that served as head of state. Army deployment could be approved only by the chairman of the Presidency, which meant that continuity of military leadership at the highest level was impossible. Similarly, deployment of the army in Germany after the kaiser's abdication could be approved only by the Parliament, fracturing the command structure to which the military was accustomed.

Given the fact that the JNA was not exclusively staffed by Serbs, Milošević needed the assistance of his generals to transform the Yugoslav People's Army into a Serbian force. From the time of Tito's death, the possibility that a breakup of Yugoslavia could occur had been increasingly real. JNA officers, used to a life of ease and privilege, did not feel secure under the supreme command of a disunited collective presidency. As the economic crisis of the 1980s and the end of the Cold War expedited the fall of Yugoslavia, transition from a rigid Communist economy to a market-oriented economy was necessary to achieve economic recovery. The JNA, however, was opposed to this transition. As Susan Woodward explains, "Reorientation to Western markets would involve huge restructuring and domestic costs. It was also risky because of the West's trade recession and political restrictions in capital markets. Trade reorientation would also require transforming the entire basis of Yugoslavia's national security, forcing reductions in military expenditures when East-West tensions were on the rise."[80]

The JNA did in fact feel the effects of the economic crisis. The defense budget, which had by definition always been untouchable, was finally cut. The JNA, once seen to guarantee the Communist regime and survival of the state, was suddenly vulnerable. Defense budget cuts coincided with the start of the dissolution of a multiethnic army. From the summer of 1991 to March 1992, the JNA makeup shifted to a 90 percent Serb force, while the remaining soldiers were mostly Montenegrins; but the dominance of Serbs in the JNA had been constantly increasing since the time of Tito's death.[81] This was all the more reason for Milošević to develop strong interpersonal relations with JNA leaders, such as Generals Veljko Kadijević and Blagoje Adžić, and Admiral Branko Mamula.[82]

The "Volunteer Units"

A special role in the "civil war" scenario that served as the basis for Serbian propaganda directed at the Western public was played by the so-called volunteer units, purportedly not controlled by regular JNA forces. These units were allegedly recruited on a voluntary basis in response to the cry of threats to Bosnian Serbs. First encounters with these Serb paramilitary forces took place in eastern Bosnia, in Bijeljina, Zvornik, Višegrad, Vlasenica, and many nearby towns. Photographs published by international press agencies showed the atrocities perpetrated against Bosniak civilians in those areas. Similar methods of control and terror were used in other parts of the country as well. The volunteer units were in the same functional category as "Special Elite Units," which were under direct control of Serbian State Security. However, despite the characterization of these volunteer units as having sprung up spontaneously out of necessity—the interpretation favored by mainstream Serbian media—nothing about the aggression against Bosnia and Herzegovina was either accidental or spontaneous.

Documents confiscated in the Second Military District, which was under the command of General Kukanjac, showed that these ostensible volunteer units were under the absolute control of the JNA. A report made by Kukanjac on March 3, 1992, is very explicit. The general reported to his superiors about as many as 63,198 volunteers in his units, obviously supplied and given instruction by the JNA:

> e) In the area controlled by the 4th Military District, in the municipalities of Kalinovik, Foča, Čajniče and Goražde 6,500 people are members of the Volunteer Units (earlier 4th Corps).
> f) JNA distributed 51,900 pieces of weapons (75%); SDS distributed 17,298.
> g) So far, 300 automatic rifles have been given to the (reliable) retired officers in Sarajevo; in the following three or four days another 100 people will be armed; these persons will defend and protect city blocks, buildings, entrances and families of active soldiers during the working hours and in situations when active soldiers join their units during encampment, battles, etc.[83]

This report clearly indicates that the volunteer units were armed largely by the JNA, in cooperation with the SDS. Also, it indicates that communication between the JNA and SDS was strong and regular, because the JNA had exact information about the number of armaments given to the Serbs by the SDS. It is obvious that these units were closely connected with and operated under the control of the JNA. In addition, there are numerous pieces of evidence proving that the Federal Security Service of the FRY was fully aware of the organization of volunteer units. Mihalj Kertes, deputy federal minister of the interior, assisted in the organization of Serbian troops throughout the territory of the former SFRY, primarily focused on preparations for attacks on Croatia and Bosnia and

Herzegovina.[84] The army of the self-proclaimed Republika Srpska (VRS) and the Yugoslav Army (the force of the rump Yugoslavia) emerged out of the Yugoslav People's Army. Hungarian general Ferenc Vegh prepared a report for the ICTY about the structure of Serbian forces for the Milošević trial. He wrote that the JNA "provided strong, determined overt assistance in the creation and organization of an emerging armed force. . . . Transfer of the previous year's experiences in combat operations and organization would have made cooperation between the JNA, the local Serb TO and MUP [police forces] effective, consolidated and fast. . . . The JNA—through the transfer of its units and resources—served as the basis for forming the new, ethnic-based army."[85]

Vegh's report was explicit that "the military leadership of the JNA would [have] functioned under the direction of political control, and would not have carried out any strategic actions independently from political influence."[86] British general Rupert Smith, who initiated the NATO bombing of Serbian positions in 1995, was also a witness in the Milošević trial. During Smith's testimony, Milošević—who represented himself—confessed in his questioning of the witness that it was "no secret at all" that Serbia had paid the salaries of officers of the Army of Republika Srpska, but he maintained that this did not imply they were under Serbian command. General Smith replied bluntly: "The man who pays the check is usually the man who is in command."[87]

Special Units of the Serbian Ministry of the Interior

In genocidal processes, irregular forces play a special role. In Rwanda, these forces actively incited and carried out violence. Such forces also existed in both Nazi Germany and Milošević's Serbia. Hitler and Milošević both commanded their special units. In public, these units were referred to as paramilitary in order to create the illusion that the state had no control over them. In this way, special forces can be used to realize the most malicious of goals, including mass murder, assassination of political opponents, expulsion of people, and the like. Orders are communicated directly, so there are rarely outside witnesses, and there is no need for a "paper trail." To have this kind of power is essential for political manipulation, but also for the perpetration of mass crimes such as genocide. It invariably entails the double rhetoric of genocide, that is, the denial of genocidal intent in public matched with genocidal planning in secret. From the very beginning of attempts to realize Greater Serbia, Slobodan Milošević adopted a strategy of using special forces, a tactic that proved to be incredibly successful in managing the international community through feigned ignorance of acts of atrocity. Similarly, Hitler used the SS, the SA, and other special troops, at first to intimidate political opponents and later to implement genocide.[88]

Slobodan Milošević had de facto and de jure control over the Serbian Ministry of the Interior (MUP) as well as over the State Security Service (DB). Lead ICTY prosecutor Geoffrey Nice proved that Milošević's control over special units was based largely on his relationship with Jovica Stanišić, chief of the Serbian Secret Service from 1991 to 1998. Witnesses and documentation confirm that Milošević controlled Karadžić and Mladić through Stanišić. Further, via Stanišić and Franko Simatović, who commanded secret forces, Milošević had under his thumb the infamous Red Berets and other special units—including Šešelj's White Eagles, Arkan's Tigers, and Medić's Scorpions—all of whom were trained in Serbia and fought outside its territory. One of the most relevant exhibits in the Milošević trial was video footage of the celebration of the Red Berets' anniversary in 1997. In the video, Jovica Stanišić, who controlled the Drina Brigade and all special units formed on its instructions, said to Milošević: "Mr. President, everything we have done so far, was done with your full knowledge and your approval."[89] The remark that explicitly linked Slobodan Milošević to all the activities of the Red Berets in Bosnia and Herzegovina, though, was made by Franko Simatović, who noted that the Red Berets had been formed on May 4, 1991, a year before the JNA was ordered to withdraw troops from the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina.[90] As Prosecutor Geoffrey Nice pointed out, this was key evidence that not only connected Milošević to Serb special units but also confirmed the continuity of his control; and the video convinced judges that Milošević had mens rea for genocide, that is, the criminal intent to commit premeditated genocide against Bosniaks. The footage that stirred the most response in the world at large and in the Serbian public, however, showed an Orthodox priest blessing members of the brutal Scorpions paramilitary group just minutes before they abused and killed imprisoned Bosniaks. Had Milošević lived to face a verdict, that footage would surely have been used as additional evidence of his guilt. Prosecutor Nice pointed out that the Orthodox priest, who blessed each of the soldiers as they stood in a line, essentially aided in their identification—every single one of them was recorded in close-up so that the momentous occasion could be captured, leaving no doubt that they were indeed Scorpions.[91]

FINANCING GENOCIDE

The former commander of U.N. forces in Bosnia, General Rupert Smith, noted in his ICTY testimony that war requires even more than human resources and intricate command networks; it requires money.[92] In his book *The Economics* *of Destruction: The Great Robbery of the People*, Mlađan Dinkić explains that gray issues—unrecorded currency printings—were used in addition to primary issue financing of the wars in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. Gray issues provided the state with the chance to purchase foreign currency from its citizens. Dinkić explains what happened with this money:

> The money was first sent to the accounts of the Belgrade Bank branch in Cyprus—an off-shore bank branch in Cyprus, where Borka Vučić was a director. Large amounts of money were transferred to accounts in other banks. One part of the foreign currency was transferred to the accounts of privately owned companies registered abroad to the members of Yugoslav political leaders, while the other part was frozen, mainly on the accounts of US and German banks. . . . Generally speaking, whenever the state wanted to make an important bank transaction it usually selected the Belgrade Bank. The sentimental bond between the state and this bank may be explained by the fact that Milošević was its director during the early 80s. . . . Finally, Ms. Borka Vučić, a staunch and dedicated communist, gained his [Milošević's] trust. She performed all tasks and worked for the salary he gave her, without asking for any other kind of financial compensation. When he realized that Borka had a unique ability to put the state's interests ahead of her own, Milošević appointed her as the director of the Bank branch in Cyprus.[93]

ICTY expert witness Morten Torkildsen forensically analyzed Serbian war financing in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. In his report for the court, he explained: "In the 1992 Annual Report of the NBRS (National Bank of Republika Srpska) . . . we read on page 4 that during 1992, when the official channels of the NBRS issued 7.45 billion dinars (primary issue), 17.5 billion dinars (grey issue) were issued by the SDK's Sokolac branch office. It is also clear from this Annual Report that the NBRS received some information about this grey issue and, moreover, that the NBRS never rejected the explanation they received regarding what the money was spent on."[94]

On several occasions, however, Milošević himself admitted that Serbia financed wars in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. In a statement submitted on April 2, 2001, to the Regional Court in Belgrade, after he was detained before transfer for trial in The Hague, Milošević wrote: "As regards the resources spent for weapons, ammunition and other needs of the Army of Republika Srpska [in Bosnia and Herzegovina] and the Republic of Serbian Krajina [in Croatia] these expenditures constituted a state secret and because of state interests could not be indicated in the Law on the Budget, which is a public document. The same applies to the expenditures incurred by providing equipment, from a needle to an anchor, for the security forces and special anti-terrorist forces in particular, from light weapons and equipment to helicopters and other weapons which still remain where they are today, and this was not made public because it was a state secret, as was everything else that was provided for the Army of Republika Srpska. In my opinion, these matters should still constitute a state secret."[95]

In addition, in a May 1993 Tanjug News Agency Special Supplement, Milošević was reported to have assumed responsibility for the economic struggle that Serbians faced as a result of his financing of the Army of Republika Srpska. Speaking with the agency's director, Milošević said: "In the past two years, the Republic of Serbia—by assisting Serbs outside Serbia—has forced its economy to make massive efforts and its citizens to make substantial sacrifices. These efforts and sacrifices are now reaching the limits of endurance. Most of the assistance was sent to people and fighters in Bosnia-Herzegovina."[96]

THE DOBANOVCI MEETING

Minutes taken at a meeting of FRY and Republika Srpska leaders, held on August 25, 1995, reveal to some degree how the Serb "joint criminal enterprise" functioned. Even though Milošević was indisputably its leader, he consulted not only with political and military leaders but also with Orthodox Church leaders on matters he considered to be of crucial importance for the Serb nation. At this particular meeting, held in Dobanovci (near Belgrade), Milošević explained that decisive steps needed to be taken, and he urged the acceptance of a "quick peace" before the arms embargo against Bosniaks was lifted. The atmosphere at the meeting, and the opinions expressed there, reinforce that political, military, and clerical leaders were familiar with plans that implied the destruction of a part of the Bosniak people, a necessary by-product of implementation of the war for Greater Serbia.[97] Radovan Karadžić, using the map, showed everybody at the meeting those populations that could be "bartered for others." According to the minutes, Karadžić also reported that "for the first time" the Americans had "agreed to the idea of population and territory exchange."[98]

With the meeting well under way, General Ratko Mladić arrived at 2:30 P.M., and it was only then that Milošević informed participants that the meeting required their absolute confidentiality. This should be viewed within the context of Mladić's role in the perpetration of genocide in Srebrenica only a month before this meeting took place. Mladić was afforded much respect at the meeting by the other participants, including Milošević himself. But Milošević felt it was necessary to support attempts for peace because the international community was losing patience. He claimed a U.S. official had indicated that "if the Serbs fail to accept the peace, the war will be made to escalate. And if Muslims refuse the peace solution," Milošević said, "they will be told that they are to be left alone with the sword of Damocles hanging above them in the form of General Mladić."[99]

The Dobanovci meeting confirms that there was consensus among the Serbian elite to use two-faced rhetoric—public and private—to implement their plans. This duplicitous rhetoric was meant not only for local populations but for international actors too. During the meeting, Karadžić suggested to Milošević that he use "crazy Serbs from Bosnia" as a scapegoat when he was unwilling to concede during negotiations, allowing Milošević to take on the role of cooperative negotiator.

Milošević insisted to the meeting's participants that difficult choices needed to be made in the face of international pressures. The president of the federal government, Radoje Kontić, warned about the increasingly difficult economic situation in the FRY, which would prevent their ability to provide assistance to Republika Srpska as they had done up to that point. Then Karadžić explicitly solicited Milošević for guidance in making a strategic military decision; he asked: "President, does this mean then that I shouldn't go to the Neretva and into Eastern Slavonia?"[100] Patriarch Pavle of Serbia eventually joined the discussion, concluding with a reminder to everyone that the Serbs faced the existential "question of 'to be or not to be.'" According to the patriarch, there was "no other choice but to stop the war and come to the negotiations. All other issues," he said, "can be resolved later, in peace, even if it takes years."[101] Bishop Irinej Bulović asked for General Mladić's opinion. Mladić talked with a sense of hubris about Serb national interests and Serb unity, but he also admitted that it was time for peace, because by then it was clear that the international community would not tolerate further Serb conquest. Mladić said, among other things, that "Serbian politicians should agree on the strategic national interests, and soldiers should accept the adopted political decision."[102] Although Karadžić insisted for tactical reasons that Bosnian Serbs be represented by a delegation at the peace talks, it is obvious that Slobodan Milošević was the "president of all Serbs"—as he was known sarcastically in some circles—and the man who had the final say in all negotiations.

The meeting in Dobranovci was held only a month after the genocide in Srebrenica, and the truth about the genocidal events that unfolded there was already known. Yet none of the participants paid the genocide the slightest heed. Instead, even church dignitaries were concerned only with the destiny of Serbs, and were full of praise and respect for Mladić and his military accomplishments.

There is of course no accidental genocide; like anything else, atrocious behavior can be reinforced through praise on one hand and a lack of punitive consequences on the other. Testifying before the criminal tribunal in The Hague, Dr. Gow explained that the Serbian criminal plan was thorough and could not have arisen spontaneously:

> A word close to "crushed," "*uništenje*," is the one that was used by Radovan Karadžić in the parliament in 1991, in the discussions regarding Bosnian sovereignty and the declaration of sovereignty, which is taken by many as a warning . . . that the Muslims will be destroyed. . . . Again, *ex post facto*, it certainly can be read as indicating what the intention was. I always have to be cautious that political rhetoric in the heat of the moment in parliament might not necessarily be setting an agenda. But I don't think we can have any doubt . . . what makes it clear is the consistent and coordinated action on the ground. It's action which cannot take place without preparation and planning. Anybody who knows the first thing about trying to organize, probably, a party let alone the use of armed forces and campaigns of this kind including the creation of detention centers, the laying out of the paperwork to go with it, the use of integrated networks to transfer people from one place to another, including from places in the so-called Republika Srpska, into Serbia proper, Serbia as in Serbia Montenegro, this is all part of something which is so completely consistent and coordinated that it could not happen without it being clearly planned and understood, but quite possibly through verbal communication a lot of the time . . . because you generally don't want to leave a written record. . . . Although over the years, little pieces, even in writing, have emerged.[103]

Among evidence that attests to the existence of the plan Gow infers, the minutes from the meeting held in Dobanovci are key to uncovering the dynamics of power within the Greater Serbia lobby. The emergence of this document nine years after the end of the aggression against Bosnia and Herzegovina affirmed Gow's statement that, over time, "little pieces"—sometimes with big effect—do indeed come to light. Genocide is a very complex undertaking, and planning and organizing it demands the support of state bureaucracy. Fortunately for those trying to punish the perpetrators of state-sponsored violence, rare is the bureaucracy that functions without any written records. And while the seven case studies of eastern Bosnian towns presented in this book rely heavily on witness testimonies, they too are informed by documentation that has materialized in the years since the genocide and the war ended.

4

GENOCIDE IN EASTERN BOSNIA

In his analysis of the political mythology employed in the bellicose propaganda of Slobodan Milošević and his allies in Bosnia, Serbian anthropologist Ivan Čolović underscores the strong emphasis they placed on linking the landscape and the Serbs who inhabited it. Čolović points out that "the 'Serbian land' is often imagined in the form of a giant figure" and that, "in this variant of the myth about Greater Serbia, geographical elements, and especially rivers and mountains, become part of the body, the spine, arteries, bosom, or shoulders of such a personified Serbian community."[1] As an example of the pervasiveness of this imagery, he quotes the Bosnian Serb newspaper *Javnost*, in which the Neretva River was called "the aorta of the Serbian bloodstream."

The Drina River, on the other hand, is often referred to as "the backbone of the Serbian national body,"[2] and this anatomical symbolism is reflected in the poem by Milutin Savčić, "As Long as the Drina Flows," which depicts the Drina as having run for centuries "through landscapes of the heavenly region" as "the backbone, strong and firm, uniting all the Serbian people."[3] The strategic goals adopted by Bosnian Serbs via their self-declared Parliament on May 12, 1992, illustrate the perceived importance of the Drina in establishing an ethnically homogenous Serbian state meant to join Serbia proper. The third of those goals was to "establish a Drina valley corridor, thereby eliminating the Drina River as a border between Serb states."[4]

By the time these strategic goals were officially embraced by Bosnian Serb leaders, their implementation was well under way in eastern Bosnia. Comparing the military tactics of the Serbian aggression in Croatia with those used in Bosnia, Branka Magaš notes that the war in Croatia built gradually from a local Serb "uprising" in the summer of 1990 to a full-scale war in the summer of 1991;

in Bosnia and Herzegovina, however, the aggression took the form of a blitzkrieg.[5] According to James Gow, the Serbian strategy in Bosnia required long-term preparations: "In view of the speed with which they were implemented and high level of coordination they revealed, these operations clearly had not been mounted spontaneously."[6]

As we saw in chapter 3, those preparations began in December 1991, when Radovan Karadžić issued secret instructions for the establishment of clandestine Bosnian Serb Crisis Headquarters (Versions A and B) and directions as to which primary instruments would assert control over the territories and be responsible for the removal of non-Serbs.[7] Version A was addressed to municipalities where Serbs were the majority and Version B to municipalities where Serbs were a minority. In eastern Bosnian municipalities, where Muslims formed the majority, Version B was applied.[8]

In November 1991, addressing SDS members, Karadžić urged them to prepare efficiently for what was to come. "I am asking you to be energetic and strict; to get ready and establish authority in your territories; in municipalities, regions, local communities, and to prepare yourselves for restructuring and regionalizing the municipalities."[9] In the first stage of implementation, local SDS leaders were instructed to form Crisis Staffs, establish Bosnian Serb Assemblies, and prepare for the formation of municipal government bodies designed to break away from legitimate Bosnian state government bodies. In the second stage, SDS leaders were told to mobilize Serb police under JNA command and to call up JNA reserves. On February 14, 1992, this second stage was activated, and local SDS leaders were called upon to establish control in their territories. Realization of the first strategic goal—separation of ethnic Serbs from other nationalities—was to start at that very moment. And, as General Ratko Mladić had warned, the physical separation of ethnicities was not possible without genocide.[10]

This chapter offers analysis of the ways in which genocide was committed in and around the eastern Bosnian towns of Zvornik, Vlasenica, Bratunac, Rogatica, Foča, Višegrad, and Srebrenica in 1992 and 1993. Although genocide was committed in a similar manner in all these places, a separate microanalysis of each will highlight some of the specific elements of this pattern of genocide when compared to other examples in world history. Then, the last part of the chapter focuses solely on circumstances in Srebrenica—which, in the spring of 1992, became a virtual concentration camp for surviving refugees—and the Serb political methodology of "slow-motion genocide" that was implemented there. Despite the dominant discourse that the massacre of eight thousand Bosnian Muslim men and boys in Srebrenica in July 1995 is the only case of genocide in Bosnia, evidence offered in this chapter presents an alternative view.

The third Bosnian Serb strategic objective, of eliminating the Drina River as the border between Bosnia and Serbia, was presented by Karadžić as of vital importance because, he claimed, it was necessary in order to "cut off the Green Transversal"—the purported efforts of Bosniaks to establish "an Islamist caliphate from 'the Great Wall of China to the Adriatic.'"[11] And local Bosnian Serb leaders, with the support of the JNA, were more than efficient in implementing efforts toward achieving this goal. In 1993, Petko Čančar, a close associate of Karadžić, reported to the Bosnian Serb Assembly that operations in Foča had been a success: "There is only one people living in the territory of Foča," he stated, "and there is only one religion practiced there." Yet another Bosnian Serb deputy ominously referred to "the green Muslim transversal" having "disappeared" in 1993—long before events in Srebrenica in July 1995—saying that "the Drina has become a noble border, not a hostile one. We have become united with Serbia and Montenegro along our border. . . . This, gentlemen, is how wisely and cleverly the Republic of Srpska, a Serb state within former Bosnia, is being established."[12]

Fear and distrust among the different ethnicities could be felt in Bosnia in 1991, well before the official outbreak of war. Bosnian Serbs who either were mobilized by the JNA or voluntarily participated in the war in Croatia contributed to an atmosphere of insecurity, bringing home a combat mentality and an intolerance toward anything non-Serb.[13] According to Sidik Ademović, a former policeman in Srebrenica, the police had difficulties entering Serb villages as early as the summer of 1991.[14] Around the same time, local radio frequencies were redirected to radio stations in Serbia proper. In this way, local stations began promoting the idea of "threatened Serb interests" while the Bosniak population remained unaware.

The groundwork for aggression and genocide in eastern Bosnia included the confiscation of personal military documents from men in Sokolac, Han-Pijesak, and Šekovići, but also in a number of municipalities where the Serbian Democratic Party (SDS) did not have a majority in the local government: Zvornik, Bratunac, Višegrad, Rogatica, Vlasenica, Goražde, Srebrenica, and Olovo. Bosniaks and Croats knew that this confiscation meant aggression would likely take place, because these documents contained precise information about the military capability of each individual in the municipalities in question. "People who had received special training on various heavy artillery, as well as all commissioned and noncommissioned officers, presented for the SDS and the Serb Army a serious threat of future organization of military units among non-Serbs."[15] As the first days of the aggression proved, these documents did indeed help Serb forces identify non-Serbs bound for imprisonment or elimination.

A COORDINATED AGGRESSION

The first step in setting the stage for a Serb offensive was to employ the Yugoslav People's Army (JNA) in cutting off the main roads while (Bosnian) Serb Territorial Defense units blocked secondary roads. Next, an order was issued to non-Serbs to surrender their arms. Bosnian Serb authorities also urged people to sign petitions confirming their loyalty to the Serb establishment. Usually, these petitions were available in stadiums and sports halls, primary and secondary schools, and industrial plants and warehouses; ironically, these are the same places where genocidal acts, mass murders, torture, and rapes took place in the ensuing years.

While researching genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina, author Samantha Power interviewed Jon Western, an analyst in the U.S. State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research in 1992.[16] His interpretation of events in Bosnia and Herzegovina was that a genocidal plan—and the system of its realization—was recognizable even in the early days of the aggression. Starting in April 1992, just weeks after the conflict began, Western reviewed nearly a thousand documents coming out of Bosnia and Herzegovina each day, many of which testified to the perpetration of mass war crimes. These documents came from a variety of sources: reports by local and foreign journalists, briefs by humanitarian workers, satellite intelligence, classified reports by intelligence agents, and more. In July, after several months of working to establish a pattern in refugee accounts, Western and a CIA colleague—both trained to be skeptical but overwhelmed by mounting evidence of serious crimes—worked tirelessly to make sense of the sea of classified documents they had at their disposal, finally assembling clear-cut substantiation of a vast network of Serb concentration camps throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina. They then conducted further analysis, which led to their conclusion that Serb tactics in Brčko resembled those in Zvornik and Prijedor—indicating coordination between activities in three distinct regions of Bosnia and suggesting that genocidal cleansing and military strikes were planned and synchronized. Samantha Power summarized Western's findings this way: "Bosnian Serb artillery would begin by unleashing a barrage on a given village; Serb paramilitaries would launch infantry assaults, killing armed men, rounding up unarmed men, and sending trembling women and children into flight. When most Serb forces moved to the next village, a cadre of paramilitaries and regulars stayed behind to 'mop up.' Within hours, they had looted valuables, shot livestock, and blown roofs off houses. Non-Serb life in Serb territory was banned. Some 10,000 Bosnians were fleeing their homes each day."[17]

Western told Power that the Serb strategy became "spookily easy to predict." He recounted: "We could see the attacks coming by watching our computer terminal screens, by scanning the satellite imagery, or often just by watching television. We knew exactly what the Bosnian Serbs were going to do next, and there was nothing we could do. Imagine you could say, 'In two days this village is going to die,' and there was nothing you could do about it. You just sat there, waited for it to happen and dutifully reported it up the chain."[18]

There is plenty of evidence from the worlds of academia, intelligence, and the media that supports the conclusion drawn by Western that a pattern of aggression existed.[19] However, the story of Jon Western—who submitted his resignation on moral grounds due to the inaction of American political leadership—proves that authentic intelligence analysis in the earliest days of the war corroborated the existence of a genocidal plan. It also proves that the American government had extensive information on crimes that occurred from the very start of the aggression; the failure of political leadership to make a priority of confronting the genocide offered an excuse for inaction on the part of the entire international community. Unfortunately, as governments around the world ignored crucial intelligence, the satellite images analyzed by Western offered play-by-play evidence of the realization of Serb strategic goals.[20]

The following case studies, from seven Bosnian towns and their surrounding areas, illustrate the genocidal process that unfolded in eastern Bosnia in 1992 and 1993. As Western and his CIA colleague found, the methods applied in its perpetration were identical in all of these places. Towns were shelled, weapons were confiscated and properties seized from Bosniaks, and civilians were murdered, expelled, or taken to concentration camps.

Also, not a single mosque in eastern Bosnia was spared damage or destruction; minarets—potent symbols of the Muslim community in Bosnia—were particularly targeted.[21] Bosnian Serb administrations, in place when genocide commenced, readily bulldozed the sites of destroyed mosques, as documented by Andras Riedlmayer as an expert witness in the Milošević case. Riedlmayer reported that "the ruins [of the mosques] were razed and the sites leveled with heavy equipment" and that these sites were then used to house "bus stations, parking lots, automobile repair shops, or flea markets."[22] Where damaged mosques still stood, Riedlmayer told the court, "damage to these monuments was clearly the result of attacks directed against them, rather than incidental to the fighting." He noted evidence of explosives having been placed inside religious buildings, and said that a great deal of the destruction of these sites occurred "under the control of Serb forces, at times when there was no military action in the immediate vicinity."[23]

Much of the Serb population took part in genocide against Bosniaks, either directly or as bystanders. Simply pointing to the house of a Bosniak neighbor was often akin to issuing a death sentence. Turning one's head away as a sign of tacit endorsement could be equally fatal. However, though rare due to aggressive propaganda and long-running social indoctrination, there were examples of neighborly solidarity in eastern Bosnia, too, and they will also be discussed.

ZVORNIK: BUREAUCRACY, SPECIAL FORCES, AND THE ORTHODOX CHURCH

A common element of all crimes of genocide throughout history is that they have been state-sponsored. In short, "genocide is a structural and systematic destruction of innocent people by a state bureaucratic apparatus."[24] The role of state bureaucracy is emphasized by all leading genocide theoreticians because the implementation of genocide would be impossible sans a well-organized bureaucracy with one goal—the extermination of some or all of a nation of people.

So-called paramilitary forces also play a special role in genocide. These forces are used to commit mass killings and ensure the displacement of a victim nation. Paramilitary units were used in this way in genocides as diverse as those committed in Germany, the Ottoman Empire, and Rwanda. Just as Hitler used SA, SS, and other special troops, Milošević relied on special and irregular forces to intimidate his political opponents and, in the end, to execute genocide.[25] Likewise, the organizers of the genocide against Armenians in the Ottoman Empire put much institutional effort into making that genocide look like uncontrolled violence, and toward that end irregular units were crucial. After the Temporary Law on Deportation was adopted on May 27, 1914, mass murders were committed by units of mercenaries consisting of former convicts. These units, known as Companies, had been officially recruited by the Committee for Unity and Progress in August 1914 to annihilate Armenians during mass deportations.[26] In Rwanda, the Interhamwe[27]—a militia that grew from a youth movement—was authorized by the Rwandan government to commit mass murder and was responsible for the genocide there.[28]

Leaders of states that plan and execute genocide often intentionally work to confuse the terms "special forces" and "paramilitary forces," hoping to keep the distinction foggy. The popular understanding of a paramilitary force is of a force that functions similarly to a professional military force but is not a part of it. It implies a parallel command and function to that of state forces, but liberates state leaders of responsibility for the crimes paramilitaries commit. Military and political leaders accused of genocide often argue that both special forces and paramilitary forces function outside the "regular" command structure. Most of the individuals accused of command responsibility at the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia used a defense in this vein. Research for this book, including the examination of numerous documents outlining the wartime functioning of Serb army and police forces, both from Serbia and from within Bosnia and Herzegovina, shows that all of these forces operated in coordination, with one command center—in Belgrade. These relationships are elaborated upon in chapter 3.

Economics is often among the motives that drive individual perpetrators of mass crimes, and this is one of the ways regular armies reward paramilitaries. This was certainly true in the genocides committed against Jews, Tutsis, and Armenians.[29] Looting is therefore a part of the genocidal process that is to be expected, and it happens at all levels, from individual property theft to institutional pilfering. Analyzing the Nazi genocide against the Jews during World War II, Raul Hilberg offered a detailed explanation of a totalitarian bureaucratic process that, in order to be achieved, must involve entire communities. Said Hilberg of the extermination of Jews: “In retrospect it may be possible to view the entire design as a mosaic of small pieces, each commonplace and lusterless by itself. Yet this progression of everyday activities, these file notes, memoranda, and telegrams, embedded in habit, routine, and tradition, were fashioned into a massive destruction process.”[30]

What Hilberg describes sheds light on the reality that, to carry out genocide, bureaucratic apparatuses must coordinate and control an intertwined network of activities directed toward that common goal. The functioning of the economy, military and police forces, the church, and all other civil and military services must be completely harmonized. Analysis of events in and around Zvornik in the early days of the aggression against Bosnia and Herzegovina shows that many aspects of genocide seen in historical examples were also at play there. The suffering of Bosniaks in Zvornik was widespread and took various forms, from torture and rape to mass executions. However, because the emphasis of this case study is on the perpetration of genocide from a systemic perspective, details of the suffering of specific victims will not be included.[31]

Fate of a Border Town

Due to its position as a border town (in northeastern Bosnia), Zvornik has historically been among the first places to endure attempts by conquerors to gain territory in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Its imposing fortress, with eighty-five cannons—a strong artillery presence even by modern standards—made it the most fortified town in Bosnia during the time of the Ottoman Empire.[32] During

World War II, Zvornik was under Ustasha (anti-Yugoslav) rule, and it was ethnically cleansed of Jews and Serbs, who were taken to Banjica concentration camp. A small number of Bosniaks joined the Ustasha movement, and a small number of Serbs joined the Chetnik (royalist) movement. There are records of two large-scale massacres in the area, one against Serbs in Drinjača and the other against Bosniaks in Sopotnik. According to available documentation, the massacre against Serbs in Drinjača was committed by Ustasha members from Croatia, and the crime against Bosniaks in Sopotnik by Chetniks from Bratunac.[33] Despite these World War II–era crimes, Serbs and Bosniaks in Zvornik remained good neighbors.[34] Neighborliness was in fact a cherished trait, and was supported by the Yugoslav ideal of brotherhood and unity. According to some witness testimonies, this factor was among those that contributed to the passivity of Bosniaks as the Serb aggression began in 1992. Many were utterly unprepared when genocidal activities were put into motion because they refused to believe that their neighbors could actively participate in preparations for their extermination.[35]

Neighbors, Serbs, and "Paramilitary" Troops

According to the 1991 census, 81,295 people lived in the municipality of Zvornik. Of those, 59.16 percent were Bosniaks (Muslims) and 38 percent were Serbs (Orthodox).[36] Although Bosniaks were a majority in Zvornik, they began the war unarmed and were surprised both at attacks from Serbia on the other side of the Drina River and at the hatred displayed by their neighbors down the street.

As has been noted in previous chapters, participation in genocide comes in many forms. A great number of Serbs participated in crimes against Bosniaks—some by providing logistical and direct support to executors, but many by simply turning their heads the other away. And, although passive, "bystanderism" is recognized as a form of participation in genocide.[37] According to witness testimonies, crimes committed on April 27, 1992, in the municipality of Divič and in villages surrounding Zvornik were perpetrated by "domestic Chetniks." Witnesses knew the attackers—their Serb neighbors—who participated in the looting, raping, torturing, and killing of Bosniak men and women.[38]

By some interpretations, the attack on Bijeljina, which happened just days before the international community's recognition of Bosnia and Herzegovina, was a warning to those who favored independence for the country. The suffering of civilians in Bijeljina as well as the activities of the JNA and special forces were aimed at intimidating and diverting both the government and the public from the idea of independence.[39] The attack against Zvornik closely followed international recognition of the sovereignty of Bosnia and Herzegovina and got lost in a sea of similar stories coming from all across the country, but the specific tactical significance of Zvornik was well known to Serb aggressors.

One of the Serb strategic goals, adopted on May 12, 1992, was to erase the Drina River as a boundary between Serb states.[40] Situated on the Drina, Zvornik has long been considered of strategic importance in protecting the integrity of Bosnia and Herzegovina. In May 1807, for instance, a report by a French consul in Travnik noted, "Zvornik is the gate of Bosnia, and if Serbians conquer it, neither Travnik nor Sarajevo will be safe anymore."[41] Nearly 185 years later, Serbian aggression along the border in eastern Bosnia started in earnest in Zvornik.

Preparations for the attack commenced immediately after the occupation of Janja. The JNA's Twelfth Corps was stationed on the right bank of the Drina, just opposite Zvornik. Forces from Serbia and special voluntary units composed of Bosnian Serbs had begun to carry out plans aimed at conquering northern Bosnia and Herzegovina. Simultaneously, occupations of towns on the Drina's left bank followed that of Zvornik, among them Bratunac, Srebrenica, Višegrad, and Foča, and somewhat more inland, the towns of Vlasenica and Kalesija. The goal was to create a semi-siege throughout most of the northeastern part of the country.[42]

There had not been a JNA garrison in the municipality of Zvornik, but in February and March 1992, when the referendum on independence was held, JNA armor, artillery, and antiaircraft units that had retreated from the deserted garrison at Jasterbarsko in Croatia were stationed close to the town. Antiaircraft artillery was positioned on the Serbian bank of the Drina.[43] Then, the municipality of Zvornik was cut off when the armor battalion of the Seventeenth Corps blocked all bridges over the river.

After leading his troops on an ominous ethnic cleansing campaign in Bijeljina, paramilitary leader Željko Ražnatović, known as Arkan, deployed his special unit to Mali Zvornik in Serbia, on the border with Bosnia and Herzegovina, where it awaited orders to attack Zvornik, which came on Wednesday, April 8, 1992. This marked the beginning of open Serbian aggression against the newly internationally recognized state of Bosnia and Herzegovina.[44] Arkan's troops were followed by other militia units, including Vojislav Šešelj's men, the White Eagles, and Bosnian Serb Territorial Defense units.[45] These forces fought alongside JNA infantry toward a common goal and will therefore be referred to simply as "Serb Army forces" in the ensuing discussion.

The attack on Zvornik was facilitated partly by artillery support from Serbia. The Seventeenth and Twelfth Corps were both very active in southeastern

Bosnia and held Zvornik under siege while special and Territorial Defense forces killed Bosniak civilians. Beyond territorial and ethnically compelled motives, Arkan's unit and other Bosnian Serb special forces were driven by economic motives as well. General Manojlo Milovanović, chief of Republika Srpska military headquarters, said about Arkan's activities in Bijeljina and Zvornik in April and May 1992: "The return of Serb voluntary units from the Republika Srpska and Republika Srpska Krajina was characterized by long formations consisting of both personnel carriers and tanks and a great number of trucks. This was a clear sign of looting."[46] Milovanović hoped to diminish the apparent extent of organization and coordination among Serb special forces by claiming that Arkan's activities were motivated by personal financial gain, not by plans of state and military bodies of Serbia and their counterparts in the parastate of Bosnian Serbs. The bureaucracy of genocidal intent was obvious, however, in numerous examples in the municipality of Zvornik: from the relocation and sheltering of Serb civilians, to mass killings and deportations of Bosniak civilians, to institutional looting of Bosniak properties.

Bureaucratic Preparations and Aggression

A great deal of evidence confirms that Serbian and Bosnian Serb preparations for the aggression started in October 1991 and that, through the SDS network, both populations were prepared for what was to come in the spring of 1992. On October 24, 1991, the date of the inaugural meeting of the Bosnian Serb Assembly, Karadžić informed Milošević that the Serbs were ready to establish not only parallel government bodies but also "full authority over the Serbian territories in BiH."[47] A project of the Ludwig Boltzman Institute for Human Rights in Vienna, for which thirty-one refugees from Zvornik were interviewed, brought forth the following revelations:

1) Serbs received weapons from the JNA or SDS in organized distributions, while Bosniaks received comparably fewer weapons and only through private channels.
2) The behavior of Serbs from Zvornik indicated they were aware of the planned aggression because, at the end of March 1992, they started leaving the town, returning only to work; and when the town was attacked, Serb women and children had already left it.[48]

Clearly, bureaucratic preparations for genocide were necessary to achieve the organized removal of Serb women and children, and to complete the physical and administrative separation of police forces—a tactic that was employed routinely throughout the country. Further, the fact that Serb women and children were able to leave towns prior to military attacks in an organized way, without letting their Bosniak neighbors know of the coming danger, shows that members of the Serb civilian population were well informed of their leaders' political and military plans. Documents related to the planned separation of a "Serb municipality of Zvornik" show that a decision on its establishment was adopted on December 27, 1991, months before the Serbian attack.[49] That decision was based on Article 4 of the "Instructions for the organization and functioning of Serb bodies in Bosnia and Herzegovina under special circumstances" of December 19, 1991, which enabled the eventual proclamation of the "Serb municipality of Zvornik" on March 15, 1992.[50] At that time, a decision was also passed to unite this newly defined region with those of Majevica-Semberija and Birač.[51] The "Serb municipality" was prepared to declare a state of war on April 6, 1992.[52]

The attack on Zvornik commenced on April 8, 1992, from both Serbian and Bosnian territories. While the JNA directed heavy artillery toward the town, Arkan's snipers shot at people from tall buildings. Bosniak defenders offered some initial resistance, but they only had small arms and light weapons. They attempted to defend the town from positions at Debelo Brdo but were conquered the same day.[53]

After taking control of Zvornik on April 9, Serb Army forces committed numerous crimes, killing and expelling people from the town and surrounding areas, or sending them to concentration camps. The villages of Divič, Donje Snagovo, Novo Selo, Dževanje, Kostarjevo, Drinjača, and Sopotnik were hit the hardest. This was among the first of Serb Army operations that demonstrated so clearly what the realization of Serb strategic goals meant for the Bosniak population, and the pattern established in these first days—of murder, forced population movement, and detention—was repeated with little delay. While advancing toward the village of Sapna in late April, Serb Army forces completely cut off the Bosniak settlements of Kozluk, Skočić Kula, and Šepak before unleashing the same fate on inhabitants there.[54]

It was not just Serbian forces who were ready for aggression in and around Zvornik. In early May 1992, Bosnian Serb peasants from the Serb village of Snagovo disarmed Bosniaks from surrounding villages and turned the village of Liplje into a concentration camp. People held captive there were tortured and killed, and women were raped. In just a few houses, four hundred people were imprisoned. Those who managed to escape from the camp organized resistance groups in the regions of Cerska and Kamenica—where the existence of the concentration camp had been unknown—and information they provided that the Liplje camp was guarded by only twelve soldiers per shift was very useful in planning a liberation operation. "Around 300 people with only 36 rifles participated"[55] in liberating the Liplje camp on June 1, 1992, and it became the only concentration camp in Bosnia and Herzegovina that was liberated in an armed operation.[56]

At U.N. headquarters, information on the mass execution of Bosniaks came in the form of dispatches, reports, testimonies, and the like. Especially detailed and cautionary were reports by Tadeusz Mazowiecki, former Polish prime minister and a special rapporteur on the U.N. Commission for Human Rights as the dissolution of Yugoslavia unfolded. One of his early reports contained reliable information on mass executions that were later investigated in The Hague as part of the transitional justice process. The report presents an abundance of terrifying details about the killing of civilians by "paramilitary" troops from Serbia, who played a key role in the genocide suffered by Bosniaks in both Bijeljina and Zvornik.[57]

The property of Bosniaks who were expelled from settlements around Zvornik was systematically looted for months after the town had fallen, demonstrating the sinister intersection of economic opportunism with genocide. Indeed, even this was planned: analysis of documentation found in the municipality of Zvornik administration building testifies to the fact that Serb authorities included economic annihilation of the Bosniak community in the region as a genocidal goal.

A number of decisions of Bosnian Serb power structures, adopted by the Crisis Staff, confirm a high level of readiness for aggression. It is clear from records of proceedings that the Zvornik municipality's economy was adapted to accommodate military plans. For example, pursuant to the "Decision on the Proclamation of the State of War," access to commodity reserves was restricted, with access to be issued only by the Crisis Staff of the Serb municipality of Zvornik.[58] As early as April 8, 1992, a variety of orders—directed toward both the military and the civilian populations—revealed an extremely well-coordinated effort that belied any Serb claims of limited capacity or authority.

The fact that the interim "government" of the Serb municipality of Zvornik passed a "Decision on the Establishment of a Special Unit of the Territorial Defense" on April 18 illustrates that the military and civilian authorities in Zvornik were unified.[59] A day later, command of the Territorial Defense of the Serb municipality of Zvornik was established.[60] However, in a session held on May 9, 1992, the establishment of special forces was postponed by authorities who wanted to wait for the status of "the Yugoslav People's Army and the status of joint units of the Serb autonomous regions of Birač and Semberija and

Majevica to be solved."[61] This was yet another decision that demonstrates the level of coordination within the Bosnian Serb and Serbian chains of command; after all, the establishment of special forces in Zvornik was contingent upon resolution of the status of the Yugoslav People's Army, ostensibly the armed force for the rump Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), not for the sovereign nation of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

In Zvornik, the same "government" passed a number of other decisions discriminating against Bosniaks, reminiscent of the Nuremberg Laws of 1935 that targeted Jews in Germany. According to the Nuremberg Laws, a distinction was made between the honorable status of a "citizen of the Reich" and the dishonorable status of a "vassal of the state."[62] An example of the discriminatory policies adopted in Zvornik include an act of April 21, 1992, that ordered the contracts of employees who failed to report for work that day be terminated.[63] The decision pertained to Bosniaks and constituted a violation of basic human rights, in this case the right to work. Earlier discriminatory decisions already had prohibited the sale of real estate by all non-Serbs,[64] had limited property sales to non-Serbs—since "real estate owned by Serbs in the territory of the municipality [was] not to be sold to members of other nationalities"[65]—and had virtually withdrawn the tenancy rights of expelled Bosniaks.[66] The establishment of an Agency for Real Estate Exchange, which oversaw the confiscation of non-Serb homes, was another attempt to legitimize the looting of real estate owned by Bosniaks.[67] A decision with similar effect declared that all deserted real estate be placed under the ownership of the interim government of the Serb municipality of Zvornik.[68]

These decisions allowed the Serb administration to dispossess the property owned by large numbers of expelled Bosniaks. In an act of feigned charity, however, municipal authorities publicly invited non-Serbs to return and register their homes in a call that was broadcast on Radio Zvornik, Radio Loznica, and TV Belgrade. Many Bosniaks believed that by registering ownership of their property they would succeed in protecting it, but it was soon clear that the call for return was a trap for Bosniak men, since only men were allowed to register. During the registration, Bosniaks were apprehended and forced to give up ownership of their property before being sent to concentration camps.[69]

Among archived documents from the Serb municipality of Zvornik is one that confirms that the Serbian Orthodox Church was complicit in the looting of Bosniak properties. In October 1992, the municipality allocated significant amounts of materials to the church, for building to be undertaken in Roćević. The materials were "to be taken from warehouses in Kozluk and Gornji

Šepak."[70] The clergy who accepted the materials knew they had belonged to Bosniaks expelled from those towns, but chose to look the other way.

Findings by researchers at the Ludwig Boltzmann Institute on the nature of the crimes committed in Zvornik concluded that the attack by Serb Army forces on Zvornik must have been planned in advance. The researchers identified institutional preparation that included the positioning of former JNA units from various corps under the first military region in Belgrade, the installation of experienced commanding officers such as Branko Popović and Marko Pejić, and the engagement of special forces from Serbia.[71] Along with the microanalysis of the bureaucratic apparatus of the Serb municipality of Zvornik offered here, the research of the Boltzmann Institute helps reveal the complexity of the execution of a genocide that could not have been achieved without involvement of entire communities: in Zvornik, as in numerous other towns in historical examples, participation in genocide was widespread—from municipal officers, to clergy, to soldiers, to victims' neighbors.

Documents analyzed for this book were signed by Branko Grujić, president of the Crisis Staff, the municipality, the interim government, and the wartime headquarters in Zvornik. On August 12, 2005, the Republic of Serbia's Office of the War Crimes Prosecutor charged Grujić and six others with war crimes against the civilian population in Zvornik. The indictment charges that the accused forcibly expelled 1,822 civilians from the villages of Kozluk and Skočić and committed crimes that took place in the Čelopek Dom Kulture (Cultural Center), at the Ekonomija farm, and in the Ciglana factory. The indictment describes the crimes in great detail but places them in the context of a "civil war." However, this case clearly demonstrates the responsibility of Serbian state bureaucracy in the genocide committed against Bosniaks. Awkward formulations contained in the indictment illustrate how hard it is to hide the state's involvement in the redistribution of population that was key to larger Serb goals. The indictment states that the Serbian Refugees Committee permitted the evacuation of Bosniaks because it was convinced the displacement was "voluntary"—in truth, Bosnian Serb Territorial Defense forces had compelled Bosniaks to sign statements "alleging that they were being evacuated subject to their free will"—but that, during their stay in Palić, near the Hungarian border, victims were "confined inside a premise [*sic*] which they were not allowed to leave [before] . . . all of them were transferred to the Republic of Hungary, while . . . their abandoned Kozluk homes were inhabited by the civilian refugees of Serbian nationality expelled from other parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina."[72] On May 19, 2003, Fadil Banjanović testified in the case against

Milošević regarding forced deportation from Kozluk and the involvement of Serbian actors in this process. Banjanović described the events that began on July 26, 1992, when special forces from Serbia, aided by local police, entered the village. His testimony emphasized the role of Serbia and Serbian forces in the displacement of Bosnian civilians and the dispossession of Bosniak property.[73]

VLASENICA: CHILD SOLDIERS AND CONCENTRATION CAMPS

The municipality of Vlasenica shared the unfortunate fate of other towns in Bosnia and Herzegovina that fell within the territorial designs for a Greater Serbia. Coordinated arming of the Serb population was conducted as it had been in the rest of eastern Bosnia. Mobilization of the population for the cause of genocide was rather extreme in the case of Vlasenica, though, because in some Bosnian Serb villages in the municipality, even underage boys were mobilized. Using children as soldiers has been characteristic of recent genocides in Africa. Child soldiers were used in Rwanda, and reports from Sudan confirm the alarming use of children in genocidal activities there as well.[74] The military use of children in conflicts around the world takes different forms. Children sometimes play the supportive role of messenger, but often they are used as soldiers in direct conflict or in paramilitary activities such as the harassment of a targeted group. In Vlasenica and the region of eastern Bosnia, Serb boys young enough to be in elementary school were armed not only with machine guns but also with fear—of the existential threat posed by “Muslims” who, they were told, were determined to kill them.

Vlasenica was also marked by another feature common to genocides—concentration camps. One of the biggest in eastern Bosnia was located in the municipality. Evidence presented here is not only from the perspective of detainees but from the perspective of their captors as well. One such captor was Dragan “Jenki” Nikolić, who was tried on charges of crimes against humanity for torturing those held in Sušica camp, in which he was a commander. Nikolić had been an unremarkable man before the war, with no criminal record and no history of nationalistic behavior, and with a number of Bosniak and Croat friends. Researchers struggle to answer the crucial question of what triggers ordinary men to commit monstrous atrocities against others. Horrific crimes were committed in Vlasenica; this chapter provides a concise survey of the events and crimes that took place in and around the municipality, and attempts to shed light on the circumstances in which such terrible crimes become possible.

The Conquest of Vlasenica: An Absurd Division

The municipality of Vlasenica is located in eastern Bosnia and Herzegovina, some fifty kilometers west of the border with Serbia and around 120 kilometers northeast of Sarajevo. According to the 1991 census, 33,817 people lived in the municipality, of which 55 percent were Muslims, 43 percent were Serbs, and 2 percent were of other ethnicities. The town of Vlasenica, located in the municipality of the same name, was home to around 7,500 people, of which some 65 percent were Muslims and 35 percent were Serbs.[75] From the start of war in Slovenia, Vlasenica was virtually an occupied zone. According to witness testimonies and documentation, a mountain battalion of the JNA was stationed in Milići, in the municipality of Vlasenica, from the autumn of 1991 onward.[76] Izet Redžić, president of the Executive Board of the Municipal Assembly in Vlasenica from 1990 to 1992, was a key witness to the arming of the Serb population and rising national tensions. According to him, the army in Milići was an exclusively Serb force that transparently displayed Serb nationalism. "This was a paramilitary unit with approximately 1,200 people. They were bearded and most of them wore Chetnik symbols. We were aware that there were military troops in the hills and forests surrounding Vlasenica. . . . Tanks were stationed in Lukić Polje and Jastebarsko, and they were constantly traveling the Milići-Šekovići route."[77]

In January 1992, Serbs from Vlasenica and eight surrounding municipalities proclaimed the area the "Autonomous Region of Birač," part of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Leadership of the (Bosniak) Party of Democratic Action (SDA), trying to ease tensions, gave in to requests of the Serbian Democratic Party (SDS), including that the municipality be separated into two parts—one Serb and one Muslim. An agreement on the division was signed on April 11, 1992, and consisted of seven densely typed pages. It detailed such absurdly defined parameters as: "The border of the Serb municipality of Vlasenica goes across the bridge on Jadar in Kuslat, then westward to Point 67 . . . eastward, and then southward on the eastern side of Slavko Novaković's house, then turns westward beneath Galib Alihodžić's house toward Miron Ostojić's house."[78]

According to Redžić, who was one of the signatories of the agreement, the goal of the SDS "was to provoke people to divide. They wanted to create tensions, and Alija Izetbegović told me not to panic, but to calm down the situation, to prevent people from fleeing and to indulge all requests of the Serb side."[79] Still, neither the accommodating politics of the SDA nor the unpreparedness of Bosniaks for war diverted the SDS leadership from initiating aggression. The theory that Serb aggression was merely a response to provocations by Bosniaks and Croats—a narrative advocated by numerous Serb revisionists—is not rooted in the reality that played out in places like Vlasenica.

By early April, armed incidents and attacks on Bosniak villages had begun. Immense political pressure was applied in Neđeljišta, Šadići, and Cikotska Rijeka. A municipal delegation, consisting of Izet Redžić, Milenko Stanić, Stanić's deputy, and two representatives from the Ministry of Internal Affairs in Vlasenica set out to evaluate the situation in the field. In Neđeljišta, they happened upon a Chetnik parade. Said Redžić, "They were armed with machine guns, wore olive green uniforms, and had cockades on their hats."[80]

Leaving Lazarević, the delegation witnessed an unbelievable sight. Redžić recalled: "40 to 50 boys aged 12 to 15 surrounded us, all of them carrying machine guns. I was shocked. It was a movie-like situation—I just could not believe somebody had armed the children. I asked them where they got the weapons from and why they needed them, and they replied: 'The JNA gave them to us, because Muslims want to slaughter us.' The children found this explanation to be clear. Their fathers had already been positioned in surrounding forests . . . and the kids were left armed in the village."[81]

On April 21, 1992, Bosnian Serb forces took over the government in Vlasenica and declared it a Serb town. According to the indictment against Dragan Nikolić, "JNA soldiers, including soldiers from the Novi Sad Corps in Serbia, paramilitary forces and local military soldiers participated in the take-over [of the town]. During the day, police vehicles drove around Vlasenica town and issued an ultimatum over loud speakers for Muslims to turn in their weapons. The Muslim population complied with the ultimatum and did not resist."[82]

As in Zvornik, Foča, Višegrad, and numerous other occupied towns, the state bureaucracy in Vlasenica implemented discriminatory measures against Bosniaks. Following the Serb takeover of the government, living conditions in the municipality deteriorated for non-Serbs. Serb authorities laid off Muslim and other non-Serb workers, limited their withdrawal of money from banks, and disallowed them to travel without special permits. Many Muslim men were apprehended and brought to the police station for interrogations that were often accompanied by physical abuse or, worse, sometimes resulted in death.[83]

Tragedy Surrounds Vlasenica

The first village in the municipality of Vlasenica to face violence was Đile. Villagers from Đile did not believe their Serb neighbors from nearby Rupovo Brdo would attack them,[84] but their fate in those first few days of May 1992 was largely due to the town's geostrategic position. The Milići-Đile-Podravanje-Zeleni Jadar-Skelani route connected Vlasenica with Srebrenica and Serbia and was the only route to the bauxite mine in Gunjaci.[85] Just days after the attack on Đile, inhabitants of the villages of Nurići, Štedra, Štedrići, Bešići, Bašča, Vrsinje, Durići, Pijuci, and Zaklopača were also subjected to the Serb extermination campaign. The State Commission for Gathering Facts on War Crimes found that "on May 8, 1992, local Chetniks surrounded Pijuci and entered Durići, a village seven kilometers from Vlasenica. Through foul play and insidiously, alleged neighbors gathered the villagers of Pijuci under the pretense that they wanted to reach an agreement in a friendly, neighborly way. The principal executor of this crime was Hajan Tešić from Tikvarić, in the municipality of Vlasenica. Mustafa Musić, Muhamed Musić, Adem Musić, Rasim Fetahović, Musa Fetahović, Bajro Durić, Šaćir Vejzović, Himzo Vejzović, Hasib Vejzović, Esad Durić and Salko Patković gathered in front of Husein Musić's store. The torturing followed."[86]

Descriptions of this torture are gruesome, and surviving women testified that they knew the names and faces of their tormenters.[87] After Durići, the Serbs moved on to the strategically important village of Zaklopača, near the village of Milići on the Vlasenica-Milići route. The village was surrounded. A number of inhabitants managed to flee toward Jadar, but all who remained were attacked without provocation. The village of Zaklopača had numbered 437 Bosniaks and 146 Serbs. Survivors testified that the crimes against them were committed by people they knew—Serbs from Zaklopača and nearby villages, accompanied by JNA reservists from Zalukovik. The inhabitants of Zaklopača were unarmed, and on May 16, Serb forces killed every villager who did not have the time to hide or who thought it was unnecessary. One survivor recounted: "Around 5 P.M. that same day the first shots were fired. We ran toward the religious school or toward a nearby hill. At the intersection near the religious school three of us turned left, while others turned right. We managed to find shelter right in front of Jovan Zekanović's house, assuming Chetniks would not attack Serb houses. We remained there for 30 minutes, which was how long our village was shot at. When the shooting ceased, Chetniks started gathering and turning on flashing lights on their vehicles, leaving the village in the direction of Milići."[88]

Among those killed were many women, children, and elderly people. Testimonies of surviving Bosniaks were so alarming they were almost hard to believe; most foreign journalists took the reports of crimes with a dose of skepticism. But later exhumation of the victims' remains demonstrated the true monstrosity of the crimes in Zaklopača. Serb forces had summarily executed seventy-two Bosniak victims, including sixteen children and ten women.[89]

The villages of Piskavice and Džamdžići became the targets of attacks two days later, on May 18. The scenario was the same: each village was surrounded, houses were burnt down, and non-Serbs were killed indiscriminately. The strategy is better known as a scorched-earth policy, by which military forces destroy anything that may be useful to their enemy. Again, the executioners were people the victims knew, and the Bosniak victims had been disarmed before the attacks, voluntarily agreeing to do so without incident in all the villages surrounding Vlasenica. After having killed or expelled the inhabitants of these villages, Serb forces established Derventa Battalion in the village of Derventa, which was later transformed into the Second Battalion of the Milići Brigade. Besides infantry units, this battalion possessed tanks, armored personnel carriers (APCs), and artillery—some of which were also stationed in the region of Rupovo Brdo. Surviving Bosniaks hid in the hills around Vlasenica; others left for Cerska, where they joined the armed resistance.

Sušica Concentration Camp

Large numbers of Bosniaks left the Vlasenica region from May to September 1992. For the most part, those who stayed put in their homes were either expelled or apprehended. By September, almost no non-Serb civilians remained in Vlasenica.[90] In the beginning, Serb Army forces kept Bosniaks and other non-Serbs in local schools or in the prison. Then, in late May or early June of 1992, they established a concentration camp in Sušica. The Sušica camp was administered by the army and local police—most of the guards were local soldiers—and as the principal camp of its sort in Vlasenica, all apprehended non-Serbs were taken there.

The Sušica camp was located about a kilometer from Vlasenica, in a military complex that had been used as a military equipment warehouse. It was a part of a systematic effort to rid the region of Bosniaks, as documents regarding its establishment confirm. Signed by the then commander of Vlasenica, Mayor Svetozar Andrić, on May 31, 1992, one of the documents calls for the "setup of a camp in Vlasenica according to international law" but only prohibits "*arbitrary* decisions on the physical liquidation of prisoners."[91] This document, while ironically referring to international law, makes it clear that liquidation of prisoners was not prohibited altogether. Only the "arbitrary" killing of prisoners was prohibited, while approved and planned killing was part of the system in the Army of Republika Srpska.

The Sušica camp consisted of two main buildings—a warehouse and a hangar—along with a small house that was used for interrogations. According to information gathered for the case against camp commander Dragan Nikolić in The Hague, between May and October 1992, eight thousand people from in and around Vlasenica were imprisoned in the camp. On average, between three hundred and five hundred people were held in the Sušica hangar at one time. Before their transfer to Bosniak-held Kladanj or Cerska, the majority of imprisoned women were raped. According to one woman from the village of Pijuci: "Dragan Nikolić (Jenki) was constantly entering the rooms and pointing to girls and women of his choice, ordering them to come with him, and returning them in an hour or more. . . . Among them was a 13-year old girl."[92]

Nikolić himself admitted to having subjected prisoners to an atmosphere of terror created through murders, assaults, sexual abuse, and other forms of physical and psychological violence; and to inhumane living conditions, in which prisoners were denied food, water, medical care, beds, and toilets. He pleaded guilty to crimes against humanity and took responsibility for the deaths of nine Bosniak men from mid-June to mid-July 1992.

According to witnesses, Nikolić displayed a particularly malignant narcissism. In the sentencing judgment against him, detainees were said to have "lived and died by the hand and at the whim or will of Dragan Nikolić." Even his own brother is reported to have begged him to stop "brutally and sadistically" beating his victims. One former detainee testified to the fact that Nikolić "enjoyed himself while he was beating people." She told the court, "I know firsthand that he enjoyed beating Arnaut Fikret. He used to beat him five times a day."[93] Nikolić would beat his victims until they fell unconscious, splash them with water so that they would regain consciousness, and beat them again. When prisoners begged him to kill them, he replied that "a bullet is too expensive to be spent on a Muslim."[94]

Most people who knew Dragan Nikolić before the war could not believe he was capable of the atrocities laid out in the indictment against him, to which he pleaded guilty in a settlement with the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. Before the war, Nikolić was a rather average citizen of Vlasenica. He was not known as a nationalist, and people claim he had more friends among Bosniaks than Serbs.[95] The ICTY subjected all accused persons to psychological evaluations that remain unavailable to the public. One day, when these files cease to be classified, they will present important material for genocide researchers trying to find an answer to the question: "What compels ordinary people to transform from friendly neighbors into mass murderers in a very short period of time?"

In late June 1992, most men imprisoned in the Sušica camp were transferred to the larger Batković camp, near Bijeljina in northeastern Bosnia and Herzegovina. Most female detainees and children were transferred to the Bosniak holdings of Kladanj or Cerska. Unlike concentration camps in the northeastern part of the country, the camps in eastern Bosnia, of which Sušica was the biggest, were inaccessible. Sušica's proximity to Serbia coupled with a poor flow of information accounted for the fact that international organizations received information regarding its existence only from survivor testimonies. *New York Times* journalist Roger Cohen went to eastern Bosnia in 1994 in search of Bosnian Serb witnesses who would corroborate these testimonies. With the help of a local driver, he managed to find Pero Popović, a former Sušica guard. Popović was very shaken by the atrocities in which he, as a guard, had inevitably participated. He agreed to repeat his story to investigators working for the American government. His testimony was the strongest in the initial indictment against Dragan Nikolić, issued on February 7, 1994. Cohen also tried to talk to others in Vlasenica about what had happened but found that Pero Popović's candor was an exception. The local Serb population persistently denied that crimes had been committed.[96]

BRATUNAC: ORDERS FROM BELGRADE AND "THE BANALITY OF EVIL"

The case at the ICTY against Miroslav Deronjić illustrates from a number of different angles that it took years for Serb leaders to plan the genocide against Bosniaks in eastern Bosnia. Planning began in the early 1990s, implementation commenced in April 1992, and the strategy was brought to culmination in July 1995, when the occupation of Srebrenica led to the worst single act of genocide in Europe since the Second World War. In his plea agreement with prosecutors in The Hague, Deronjić—wartime president of the Bratunac Crisis Staff—admitted to most of the facts presented here. His case helps emphasize the international dimension of genocide, and highlights the role of Serbia in the arming of Bosnian Serbs as well as the role of the ICTY in researching war crimes and formulating indictments. The case against Deronjić was strongly criticized by the international nongovernmental sector and victims' associations in Bosnia and Herzegovina when the prosecutor decided to charge Deronjić only for a massacre in Glogova, ignoring his role in other crimes committed in Bratunac from 1992 to 1995. The ICTY Deronjić case is analyzed here in the context of its contribution to the theory imparted by nationalist propaganda that is built on the relativization of Serb crimes, and in the wider context of the censorship of information about the genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The role of local intellectuals in proliferating radical nationalism and in mobilizing the local population for participation in a genocide is evaluated here through examination of Deronjić's biography, the ICTY judgment against him, his interviews with prosecutors, archived documents, wartime reports by NGOs, and interviews with witnesses. Evidence in the Deronjić case—as well as from other incidents in the municipality of Bratunac in 1992 and 1993—points to the coordination of all Serb Army forces in their goal to exterminate Bosnian Muslims. According to prevailing Serb propaganda, paramilitary forces that were not under state command were responsible for the mass killing of Bosniaks. Both Serbia and Republika Srpska deny any genocidal intent at the state level by invoking a narrative in which bands of independently organized, armed Bosnian Serbs acted with no common command. But genocide is a crime that cannot be perpetrated without the consensus of the nation in whose name it is committed—in this case as in every other, it is impossible that it was carried out by isolated groups without a well-developed plan and a common goal.

Intellectuals, Nationalism, and Genocide

The biography of war criminal Miroslav Deronjić, born in 1954 in Magašići, in the municipality of Bratunac, is stereotypical. He was a diligent student in the Department for Yugoslavian Literature in Sarajevo. After graduation, Deronjić worked for a short time as an assistant editor at the daily newspaper *Oslobođenje* and as a journalist at Radio Sarajevo.[97] In the mid-1980s he left for France, where he worked as a teacher for two years. He then returned to eastern Bosnia—to Srebrenica—and continued working in education until 1990. He was the literature teacher in the secondary school. Prior to his active involvement in SDS politics, there had been absolutely no indication that he harbored nationalistic beliefs when the party was formed in 1990. He had no criminal record and lived an average, middle-class intellectual's life with his wife and two sons.

From September 1990 until the end of April 1992, Deronjić was president of the Bratunac Municipal Board of the SDS.[98] He was president of three Bratunac Crisis Staffs from the end of October 1991 until June 1992, when he was appointed a member of the War Commission of the Bratunac Municipality.[99] Then, in the summer of 1993, Deronjić became a member of the Main Board of the SDS, continuing his swift ascent to power in the party.[100] On July 11, 1995, he was named civilian commissioner for the municipality of Srebrenica, and in 1996 he was appointed to the vice presidency of the SDS under Radovan Karadžić, a position he resigned from in 1997. Deronjić's political career, nonexistent just two years before the war, not only extended beyond Bratunac but landed him at the very top of the SDS. It is possible that Deronjić's position was always seen as one of importance in the SDS while war was on the horizon, given the strategic importance of Bratunac in the realization of Serb strategic goals. His postwar rise in the SDS, though—a party that testimony in the ICTY confirmed played a vital role in planning and executing a "joint criminal enterprise" in Bosnia and Herzegovina—can be justified only by his wartime "merits."

The municipality of Bratunac was of critical strategic importance for the cause of Bosnian Serbs because it was the territory that connected the Serb population in Bosnia and Herzegovina with neighboring Serbia. The majority of the population in Bratunac was Muslim. According to the 1991 census, of 33,619 inhabitants, 21,535 were Muslim, 11,475 were Bosnian Serb, 223 declared themselves "Yugoslavian," 40 were Croat, and 365 reported they were of other nationalities.[101] The municipality of Bratunac is bounded by a narrow turn of the Drina so that the river constitutes most of the municipality's northern and eastern borders, with Serbia a stone's throw away. To the south lies the municipality of Srebrenica, to the west Milići, and to the north Zvornik. The Bratunac-Voljavica-Bjelovac-Skelani route leads to a bridge over the Drina, which connects this region with Serbia by road.

THE ARMING OF SERBS: FROM BELGRADE TO BRATUNAC

The rise of national tensions in this region has a long history. There are indications that the Serbian State Security Service (SDB) was developing plans for destabilization of the area some fifteen years before the war began.[102] But the first concrete steps toward engaging the Serb population in an eventual aggression were taken by the SDB as early as August 24, 1989, when documents were leaked that Serbs were allegedly endangered in eastern Bosnia by Muslim nationalism, and further that Serbs were being expelled from the municipalities of Srebrenica and Bratunac.[103] These assertions were made at a time when rising unemployment and devaluation of real wages meant that many people were migrating for socioeconomic reasons, but the climate was ideal for consolidating ethnic distrust. The first ethnically fueled killing of Bosniaks in the municipality of Bratunac occurred more than half a year before the official start of war, on September 3, 1991, when Džemo Jusić and Nedžad Hodžić were murdered in the hamlet of Kajići, in the village of Kravice.[104] Although the identity of their killers was known, SDS officials prevented their prosecution.[105]

The prewar arming of Bratunac was a top priority of the SDS. In April 1991, during a session of the SDS Main Board, Karadžić essentially declared war—claiming publicly that Serbs were left only with the option of creation of a Greater Serbia. Deronjić later testified that he heard for the first time about plans to divide Bosnia and Herzegovina in an informal meeting that followed, at which both Karadžić and Goran Zekić (a member of the SDS Main Board from Srebrenica) were present. At the end of that month, Deronjić and Zekić met with SDS leader and bauxite mine owner Rajko Dukić, in Milići. Dukić said then that the political leadership of the SDS in Bosnia had decided that Bosnian Serbs ought to be armed, asserting that Radovan Karadžić had personally persuaded Slobodan Milošević (president of the Republic of Serbia at the time) to arm Serbs in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Dukić told Deronjić and Zekić that they would be tasked with operations in the municipalities of Srebrenica and Bratunac.[106]

Early in May 1991, Deronjić and Zekić met in Belgrade with Mihalj Kertes, the head of the Yugoslav Federal Customs Bureau (who was under the influence of Slobodan Milošević),[107] and they arranged the first delivery of weapons to Bratunac. Kertes relayed that political and state leadership of Serbia, with whom he was close, had decided that Bosnian territory fifty kilometers inland from the Drina would become Serbian. In his testimony before the ICTY, Deronjić specified that early weapons deliveries were facilitated "through the Yugoslav Army"[108] but that by late 1991 a center for distribution of weapons was established in Milići.

The role of Serbia in arming Bosnian Serbs is clearly outlined in Deronjić's testimony, at times blatantly. He told the court: "All this was planned by the top leadership of the SDS in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the military structures in Yugoslavia . . . and the state structures in Serbia."[109] Additional evidence was presented to support this thesis in the case against Milošević. A protected witness who was known in court simply as B-129, a secretary to feared paramilitary commander Arkan, testified to the coordination of Serbian and Bosnian Serb forces in the aggression against Bosnia and Herzegovina. She was present when Milošević emphasized to Kertes that Arkan had to be controlled, saying, "We need people like this now, but no one should think that they are more powerful than the [Serbian] state."[110] In her testimony, B-129 confirmed that Arkan was indeed under Serbian state control, claiming he "always [said] that without orders from the DB, the state security, the Tigers were not deployed anywhere." This evidence clearly undermines attempts by current leadership to dismiss state-level responsibility through claims that paramilitary forces acted independently and on their own whim.

Deronjić admitted in his testimony that he learned from Zekić that the displacement of Bosniaks involved the use of force, which Deronjić understood to be "a component part of the plans for creating the Serb Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina."[111] As to the Serbian role in this use of force, he said it "included the conduct of the volunteer units . . . the conduct of the Yugoslav People's Army . . . and the conduct of the crisis staffs" with the "final or ultimate objective . . . to expel the non-Serb population.[112] On April 17, 1992, Serb Army forces took control of the municipality of Bratunac. Systematic efforts to disarm Muslims began immediately and were completed by the end of April.[113] Within the process aimed at securing Bratunac as Serb national territory, “volunteers” from the SFRY crossed the Drina River—entering the village of Skelani, in the municipality of Srebrenica, on April 14 or April15, and Bratunac on April 17. Soon after, Bosniak leaders from Srebrenica and Bratunac were told to surrender their weapons and legal authority to the Bosnian Serbs or risk annihilation by “thousands of Serb soldiers who were amassed across the Drina River in Serbia.”[114] Muslim representatives complied, and political power in the municipality of Bratunac was assumed by the Crisis Staff, with Miroslav Deronjić as president.

Paramilitary “volunteers” were not the only ones who crossed the Drina with orders from political and military leadership in Serbia. Around April 21, a small unit led by a JNA captain named Nikola Reljić arrived in Bratunac. Reljić put a military government in place, informing the local population, through posters he placed around town, that he was the commander of Bratunac and assumed all liability for events there.[115] In his statement, Deronjić indicated that the arrival of both JNA troops under Reljić and irregular forces from Serbia was ordered from Belgrade.[116]

Serb forces, consisting of JNA troops, Bosnian Serb Territorial Defense (TO) units and police, and special forces from Arkan’s and Šešelj’s men and the White Eagles, besieged the municipality of Bratunac on May 5, 1992.[117] Part of the Bosniak population escaped to surrounding hills, but around eight thousand Muslims were put into a camp at the Bratstvo football club stadium. “The atmosphere was sickening. Soldiers in JNA uniforms walked around carrying bags and taking away people’s jewelry and money,” says Rifat Begić, who was separated from his wife, son, and mother shortly after arrival at the stadium. Along with some eight hundred other Bosniaks from the municipality, he was subjected to torture. Begić says that when he talks now about the things he saw and suffered through, they seem unreal. It was horrible and incomprehensible: “A couple of times they put their cigarettes out against my forehead. They would also hit my head with iron rods. I watched them engrave crosses into people’s foreheads. I witnessed the murder of Efendi Mustafa Mujkanović. They subjected him to unimaginable torture. They were forcing him to raise three fingers, which he refused to do. Then they asked him if he knew how to bow in prayer. When he started praying, they killed him.”[118]

At the Vuk Karadžić school in Bratunac, where Begić was transferred to, it was not only soldiers who tortured Bosniaks. “The guards had blue uniforms and were members of Serb police forces. Once, when I was allowed to go out and get some water with a couple other detainees, I even saw members of the Civil Protection Service. I think their task was to remove the bodies of killed Bosniaks," he said. Begić recognized a number of Serbs from Bratunac among those torturing Bosniaks.[119] After three days of horrendous treatment, surviving Bosniaks were transferred to a camp in Pale, where they were again subjected to beatings. Finally, on May 14, the surviving prisoners were released in exchanges in Vratnica and Visoko.

In August 1992, trailing the appalling stories told by refugees from the municipality of Bratunac, a team of Dutch journalists visited the town. They learned nothing about the massacre of Bosniaks from the Serb government, but decided to secretly visit the Vuk Karadžić school—in which some three hundred people were killed. There, they saw bullet holes, a recently replaced wooden floor, and freshly painted walls. In the vicinity of the school was a garbage container that contained ID cards bearing Bosniak names. In a battery factory in Potočari, they found Bosniak passports belonging to residents of Bratunac.[120] "It is presumed that around 300 Bosniaks were killed in those three days, around 150 in the gym and 150 in front of the school. There is circumstantial evidence that a number of bodies were burnt, in order to remove any evidence of the crimes," according to Begić.[121] On May 12, 2007, ninety-three Bosniaks from Bratunac were buried at the local cemetery. Remains of the rest of the victims have not yet been found.

Glogova

Bosniaks who were tortured and killed at the Vuk Karadžić school were the surviving inhabitants of the village of Glogova and of several others that were ravaged by Serb Army forces in late April and early May 1992. As president of the Crisis Staff, Miroslav Deronjić had de facto and de jure control over TO units and de facto control over Bratunac police forces. On April 25, 1992, these local forces, together with the JNA's Novi Sad Corps, had arrived in the village of Glogova in armored personnel carriers, military trucks, and police vehicles.[122] They searched for weapons and ordered that the villagers surrender their arms within two days, and on April 27, residents of Glogova did just that. The operation was coordinated by Deronjić, Captain Reljić, and Serb interior ministry chief Milutin Milošević, who promised the villagers that they would not be attacked.[123] The atmosphere in Glogova had already been very tense—Bosniaks were living in fear while Serbs from the neighboring village of Kravica openly armed themselves. According to one villager, "Serbs were freely carrying weapons and bragging about their experience from the war in Croatia."[124]

At the end of the first week of May, in spite of Milošević's promise, Deronjić and Reljić went to the village of Magašići for a bird's-eye view of Glogova. Deronjić testified that the purpose of the visit was to study Glogova from above in order to advance preparations for attack.[125] In introductory remarks at a Crisis Staff meeting on May 8, Deronjić said, among other things, that the attack on Glogova would take place the following day. He explained the village's strategic importance, adding that the creation of a Serb national territory could not be achieved in the municipality of Bratunac until Glogova was conquered and its Muslim population transported to non-Serb central Bosnia. If the Glogova operation succeeded, Deronjić said, permanent removal of Bosniaks would be continued in Bratunac, Voljavica, and Suha. The Bratunac Crisis Staff adopted the plan.[126]

It may seem that this emphasis on the strategic importance of these small eastern Bosnian villages in the creation of Greater Serbia was exaggerated. But Glogova and Voljavica were serious obstacles to the realization of Serb plans. Glogova is located in the vicinity of Serb stronghold Kravica, and Voljavica on the Bratunac-Sase-Srebrenica route as well as the Bratunac-Fakovići-Skelani route, which was an important transport route out of Bosniak-dominated Srebrenica and a link with the "Serb municipality of Skelani."[127]

In his testimony, Miroslav Deronjić admitted that when he issued the order to attack Glogova on May 8, 1992, he was aware the village had been disarmed. He admitted having command control over all local forces and agreement from Captain Reljić regarding active JNA participation in the attack.[128] In the early morning of May 9, 1992, Serb Army forces surrounded Glogova. The unarmed Bosniak population offered no resistance when the village was taken.

Woken by his mother, who had been alerted that Serb forces were coming, one witness jumped out the window of his house and, hidden in a nearby forest, watched as neighbors were massacred and his village was destroyed.[129] His account of events parallels ICTY evidence. As he hid, Serb forces executed sixty-four unarmed Bosniaks in just a few hours. The local mosque was blown up, and houses, businesses, fields, and haystacks were set on fire.[130]

The Meeting in Pale: Coloring the Map Blue

Just two days after the attack on Glogova, Miroslav Deronjić was invited to Pale and asked to file a report on events in the village and in the municipality of Bratunac generally. He presented his report at a meeting held in the Panorama Hotel attended by Radovan Karadžić, Velibor Ostojić, and Ratko Mladić along with fifty more people, including Crisis Staff presidents from numerous municipalities. The focus of the meeting was security and the military situation in the field. On the wall was a map indicating the ethnic composition of Bosnia and Herzegovina, with Serb regions marked in blue.[131] Deronjić pointed out his municipality on a map and reported that Glogova had been attacked and was partly destroyed, and further that all Bosniaks had been displaced from the village by force. Following applause, Velibor Ostojić pronounced: "Now we can color Bratunac blue."[132]

In the village of Suha, which had been disarmed following the operation in Glogova, only thirty-eight Bosniaks—all women, children, or elderly—remained by June 3, 1992. On that day, they were all executed. When their bodies were exhumed on May 11, 2005, those of eight children were found. The youngest was two years old.[133] This massacre was carried out in accordance with the Serb aim to "color Bratunac blue." Afterward, no living Bosniaks remained in the municipality.[134]

JUDGMENTS AND (IN)JUSTICE

The case of Miroslav Deronjić in the Bratunac SDS—his Crisis Staff presidency, his role in arming the local Serb population, his constant consultations with Belgrade and the Bosnian SDS leadership, and his links with the JNA—demonstrates the functioning of the Serb genocidal system, from the stages of planning and organization to command and final implementation.

The events in Bratunac and Glogova constitute merely a part of the story of Deronjić. It continued in Srebrenica and for two years after the end of the war, when he was tasked with covering up the genocide committed there. On July 11, 1995, when the worst single genocidal event in the Serb aggression against Bosnia started, he was appointed the civil affairs commissioner in the municipality of Srebrenica.[135] Although Deronjić played a key role in other war crimes committed in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the prosecution in The Hague chose to limit the indictment against him to events in Glogova only. In exchange for his confession, and for testimony against other high-level indictees, Deronjić was sentenced to only ten years' imprisonment. The outraged reactions that came from victims' associations were not surprising. But what was surprising was the public opposition of the trial chamber's presiding judge, Wolfgang Schomburg, who did not stop at dissenting opinion, as the legal practice requires, but publicly criticized the prosecution for making a settlement that was not "within the mandate and spirit of [the] Tribunal."[136]

Judge Schomburg questioned the credibility of any remorse shown by Deronjić, stating that he felt the accused had tried to minimize his guilt. In his dissenting opinion, he said: "The sentence is not proportional to the crimes it is based on" and Deronjić was due "a sentence of no less than twenty years."[137]

The essence of Judge Schomburg's opposition lies in the question: Why was Deronjić charged only with the massacre in Glogova, limiting the indictment to one day in one village, even though he was president of the Crisis Staff at the time and therefore responsible for command of crimes committed in the entire municipality of Bratunac? Judge Schomburg also questioned why Deronjić was not charged as a co-perpetrator in the "joint criminal enterprise leading to the horrific massacre at Srebrenica in 1995," as he felt on a "*prima facie* basis that there should be enough reason to indict Miroslav Deronjić for his participation in that massacre."[138]

The prosecution's post-trial response, that it did not have enough evidence to issue further charges against Deronjić, was unconvincing. Florence Hartmann, the tribunal's spokeswoman, said: "When you bring an indictment you need to meet certain criteria . . . and we just did not meet them for all the events" that came to light in the case.[139] In fact, Judge Schomburg—one of the most distinguished judges at the tribunal—was more than qualified to evaluate the legitimacy and strength of evidence presented in prosecution indictments and by Deronjić himself in testimony before the court. The reality is that the case against Deronjić was just one of a series of cases in which settlements were made by The Hague with war criminals. The U.N. Security Council set a deadline for operations at the ICTY, according to which the tribunal was to issue its last indictment by the end of 2004 and complete all trials by the end of 2008. Confessions had a positive impact on the tribunal's efficiency by lowering the costs of marathon trials and investigations. On the tribunal's list of priorities, justice and economics shared center stage.

Miroslav Deronjić's confession provided an opportunity to evaluate the role of local Serb intellectuals in implementing nationalistic Serb goals, as well as to see the link between Serbian political and military leadership in Belgrade, led by Slobodan Milošević, and a micro-region such as Bratunac. Links with the Serbian government, the JNA, and Serbian special forces existed in all occupied Bosnian territories as they did in Bratunac. The case against Deronjić also highlighted the role of the international community. Throughout this book, the denial or deprioritization of genocide in Bosnia on the part of Western governmental actors has been explored, especially in the context of how that lack of recognition was used to absolve those actors from any responsibility to intervene. In this case, it was the ICTY that relativized these crimes. The Hague prosecution used the concept of restorative justice to rationalize the use of Serb confessions coupled with shortened sentences. But such settlements, of which Deronjić's was just a drop in the ocean, do not align with the intent of restorative justice.

The goal of restorative justice is simple: reconciling perpetrators and their victims. In cases of war crimes, and especially in cases of genocide, the goal of restorative justice has a wide social context. The process of reconciliation is complicated, because mass war crimes result in the long-term effect of destroying trust among individuals and groups in a political community. There is a consensus among theorists of restorative justice that there are three necessary steps toward its achievement. First, perpetrators must fully understand the consequences of their acts. It is not sufficient that perpetrators formally plead guilty; they have to *feel* guilty, because guilt is an appropriate moral response to the crime committed. Second, perpetrators must undertake voluntary steps to pay for their crimes—including anything from reparation, in other words indemnification for financial losses, to moral indemnification, which should include heartfelt regret and apology. Finally, perpetrators must accept punishment with the aim of repairing the moral damage they have inflicted. Some call this third step a sentence. However, a sentence is imposed, while restorative justice requires that perpetrators voluntarily accept atonement as an inevitable price for their crimes.[140]

In 2007, only three years after the judgment in his trial, Deronjić died of cancer while serving his sentence in Sweden. His death did not prompt much analysis, and media throughout the former Yugoslavia paid it little attention.

The ICTY's fundamental motive is the search for truth, a process which it is hoped will alleviate individual and social traumas and bring about reconciliation more quickly, as well as contribute to the prevention of genocide in the future. The case of Deronjić and others like his, however, have to a great extent compromised this motive.[141]

ROGATICA: REPEATING THE PAST AND THE ROLE OF "SAVIORS"

As in numerous other municipalities in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the extermination of Bosniaks, their culture, and their national identity was coordinated and systematic in Rogatica, proof yet again of the larger Serb genocidal plan. As I stated earlier in the book, similarities in the execution of this plan can also be found in examples of genocides in other states and historical periods. Genocide against one national group is preceded by discrimination, then by select killings of distinguished members of a community, then by mass killings, the rape of women, the establishment of concentration camps, the destruction of religious and cultural monuments, and the looting and dispossession of property. The example of Rogatica will elaborate merely a few elements at play in that process: the consequences of a failure to punish perpetrators of genocide, the brutality of extermination methods, the role of ordinary Bosnian Serbs in the genocidal process, and the role of "saviors."

A failure to punish always leaves open the possibility that genocide may be repeated. Many genocide analysts claim that the denial of genocide or a failure to punish the responsible has, in numerous examples and throughout world history, led to a reoccurrence of genocide.[142] One of the characteristics of genocide is the indoctrination of ordinary people to compel their participation, which may take many forms. For genocide to occur it is necessary that all strata of a population be involved. This, of course, does not mean that all members of a nation in whose name genocide is committed are participants in genocide. In every genocidal process, there is a certain category of the population known as saviors.[143] The case of Rogatica demonstrates that a majority of the Bosnian Serb population there was involved in the genocide, though in differing capacities; in one Bosnian Serb village near Rogatica, however, a number of Serbs resisted their leadership's genocidal ideology.

In the Ottoman Empire, Rogatica was called Čelebi Pazar. As early as the sixteenth century, this little town had a water-supply system, a public bath with both hot and cold water, a downtown with *musafirhanas* (inns) and *karavansarayas* (larger inns), and religious schools. Mosques in Rogatica, of which there were once many, suffered in repeated attempts to exterminate the Bosniak population in this region. In World War II, the town was literally leveled. "Of all the public buildings only the elementary school, two damaged mosques, Čaršijska and Arnautovića, and two churches, the Orthodox and the Catholic, remained."[144]

In 1992 and 1993, Serb Army forces in Rogatica destroyed almost every Muslim religious building in the town center. The Arnautovića Mosque's minaret was destroyed, and the mosque itself was damaged.[145] Mosques, imams' houses, and other religious buildings were destroyed in the surrounding communities of Šetići, Rakitnica, Godomlja, Kramer-Selo, Žedovići, Kovanje, Sljedovići, Lubardići, Živaljevići, Batovo, Košutica, Brda, Vragolovi, Kukavice, and Sljedovići.[146] In World War II, the Chetniks committed genocide against the Rogatica Bosniaks in a scenario identical to the one that played out in 1992. Bosniaks in the region suffered at the hands of their neighbors during the recent aggression and, as Nusret Agić noted in his research, during World War II as well. In Agić's account,

> Serbs, Orthodox, the closest neighbors, would first besiege a Bosniak village and make the population gather in a house or two, depending on the size of the village and the number of its inhabitants. They would take the men to

> the Borika stud farm under the pretence that they needed them for some important business. This is why the men went there voluntarily. No one would ever hear from them again. Only a handful managed to escape certain death. Women and children would remain in the villages. It is hard to describe how the neighbors tortured our grandmothers, women, girls and children by abusing, raping, killing and looting them. When the Chetniks were done, the whole Orthodox population from the surrounding villages, everybody who could walk and carry anything, would rush to the attacked Bosniak village like a flock of hyenas, take all that could be carried away, drive cattle away, and steal poultry. . . . Moments later, a blaze would engulf the village and in a few hours in would be erased from the face of the Earth.[147]

The methodology of genocide used against Bosniaks during the Second World War has also been documented by Šemso Tucaković. According to his research, the extermination of Bosniak peasants in eastern Bosnia was executed using a well-developed system. First, they were persuaded by their Serb neighbors to surrender their weapons. The Serbs promised the Bosniaks protection by the Chetniks, a royal army.[148] Tucaković writes: "Wherever weapons were surrendered, punitive expeditions comprising executioners arrived. They were followed by hordes of looters, who took away all they could find, either on their own or on their horses' backs. They would first capture the men, telling them they were taking them to 'the command for a hearing.' But they would kill them at the first stream or concealed site they came to."[149]

In Bosnia and Herzegovina, and in the Rogatica region, it was clear by 1991 that 1942 was likely to be repeated, and that the Yugoslav motto of brotherhood and unity had been laid bare as a myth. That Bosniaks once again fell victim, unprepared, demonstrates how dangerous it can be when a nation fails to remember its own history. On the other hand, in the case of Bosnian Serbs, the dangers of twisting history for manipulative purposes were just as real.

In 1991, the SDS established the Assembly of the Serb People in Bosnia and Herzegovina, a parallel, para-statal governmental body, which was exclusively Serb.[150] In September 1991, Rogatica was absorbed into the "Serb Autonomous Region of Romanija." Barricades had been set up in the municipality as early as May 16, 1991, and by autumn of that year, Rajko Kušić had declared himself the Chetnik leader in the municipality of Rogatica by dubbing himself *Vojvoda* (Duke).

Early pressures levied against Bosniaks from Rogatica began on March 30, 1992, when Kušić, along with SDS president Sveto Veselinović, requested that police forces be divided into a Serb and a Bosniak force. Most Serbs sent their wives and children away, leaving only physically able men in the town, as Serb

Zoran Bojević confirmed in State Court proceedings: "In March, I took my wife and child to Bajina Bašta for safety reasons."[151] The shelling of Rogatica commenced on May 12. Settlements and villages with a Muslim majority were targeted first. When their Serb neighbors told Bosniaks to gather at the high school in Rogatica, they obeyed, believing they were being warned out of concern for their safety. Jasmina Delija was among the first to arrive at the high school, with her husband and their two children. Fifty people were already there, and three hundred more were brought after her arrival. They were all Bosniak. Like other women and children, Jasmina and her children were exchanged on August 8, 1992. Working-age men remained in the ad hoc camp. Jasmina's husband and other men left behind were killed.[152] Nadža Isaković also believed she would be protected in the shelter of the high school in Rogatica. Through a megaphone from an armored car, the Serb leadership had guaranteed safety to all who would go there voluntarily. "It turned out to be a concentration camp," reflected Nadža.[153] She related that masked Serbs from Rogatica tortured captive Bosniaks. She was lucky not to be among the numerous women and girls taken away by Serb soldiers to be raped.[154]

Why did Bosniaks believe their Serb neighbors despite knowledge of horrific experiences suffered by Muslims in World War II? The reason could lie in the myth of brotherhood and unity that was imposed on all Yugoslavians from 1945 on. This myth erased the emotional memory of earlier mass killings. On the other hand, it offered Serbs a chance to develop a denial mechanism for crimes committed both in World War II and from 1992 to 1995.

Mile Ujić was head of the army's administration in Rogatica in 1992. In his 2006 testimony before the State Court of Bosnia and Herzegovina, he claimed to have visited friends being held at the high school, where the Bosniaks, according to Ujić, were sheltered for their own safety. "I asked them if they had any problems. They all said, 'No Mile, we are fine. . . . The food is good and the only thing we lack is cigarettes.'"[155] However, Ujić confirmed that a day after his visit, he heard about the killing of civilians. When he tried to find out more, the police chief told him not to ask too much lest he end up in trouble.[156] Witness Goran Kozić admitted he heard about the suffering of Muslim civilians about a month after the fact, on Bosnian radio. "That event was hardly ever spoken about on our side."[157]

HUMAN SHIELDS

One of the methods used by Serbs to kill Bosniaks was to employ them as human shields. Serb Army forces took detainees from the high school in Rogatica and the Rasadnik camp and sacrificed them in an attempt to defeat resistance fighters in the villages around Rogatica, who had somehow managed to organize themselves in July and August 1992 to liberate the occupied Bosniak villages of Šljedovići, Solakovići, and Starčići.[158] Nusret Agić told the State Court how Rajko Kušić had ordered that thirty detained Bosniaks be brought to Kozići "to be used as a human shield which would precede the [Serb] killing units and neutralize any potential mine fields."[159]

The Bosniaks were tied together in groups of two or three and forced to walk toward Tušine, Jačen, and Brčigovo. Cut short by Bosniak defenders, who opened heavy fire from their defense lines in Brčigovo, the Serb infantry was forced to retreat. A few Bosniaks were wounded, but so were a number of the Serb soldiers, so the attack was considered a failure, and the Bosniaks were ordered executed.[160] Three survived, though they never could have believed that they would live to testify to their ordeal.

Ago Kapo—known as "the Captain"—fled from his village of Borovsko when it was attacked in August 1992 and was apprehended in Žljebovo before being taken to the Rasadnik camp.[161] For a few days, together with other detainees, he was ordered to clean the homes of Serb officials. Five days later, on August 15, they were all taken to the village of Duljevac in a small bus. Once there, they were used by Serb Army forces as a human shield for two hours before a Bosnian Serb soldier, Dragoje Paunović, ordered their execution. Except for Paunović, all of the soldiers were masked, so Kapo was unable to see their faces. Perhaps Paunović remained uncovered because he was convinced that no one would survive; but there is no perfect crime. And so, seventeen years later, Dragoje "Špiro" Paunović sat in a courtroom listening to Kapo testify, faced by the reality that his crime had in fact not been perfect. On that August day in 1992, twenty-seven innocent Bosniaks had been killed.[162] Yet Ago Kapo lived to tell the truth in Bosnian State Court.

Armin Bazdara was also there that day.[163] He was hit in his upper arm, but Serb troops failed to notice he had survived. He lay on the ground voiceless, listening to shots and screams. Whenever the troops noticed someone was alive, they would shoot him again. At one point, he heard a voice on the walkie-talkie asking, "Who is shooting?" A soldier answered, "Špiro's shooting." Armin decided to run. Serb soldiers shot at him as he ran, but missed. Exhausted from hunger and loss of blood, he arrived at a hill above some weekend homes, where he saw the outlines of soldiers. Far too weak to run any farther, he was ready to surrender. Luckily, the soldiers were from the army of Bosnia and Herzegovina.[164]

The men who survived the execution felt great satisfaction on May 26, 2006, when judgment in Paunović's case was rendered. The crime was labeled a crime against humanity, as stipulated in Article 172, paragraph 1, item (h), of the

Penal Law of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and three counts—of persecution against an identifiable group on political, racial, national, [or] religious . . . grounds; of murder; and of inhumane acts intentionally causing great suffering—were brought against the accused. Dragoje Paunović was found guilty of the execution of twenty-seven Bosniaks from the Rogatica region and was sentenced to twenty years' imprisonment.

SAVIORS

Dr. Zoran Gavrić was one of the Bosnian Serbs who shared the naivety of his Bosniak neighbors and failed to notice the danger of an emerging Serb nationalism. Originally from Visoko, Gavrić worked for years as a dentist in Rogatica. He was well known for his good nature.[165] One March day in 1992, he invited his Bosniak friend, Ćamil Poljo, a medical technician, for drinks—hoping to escape for an evening from the tension that was palpable in Rogatica at the time. The next morning, Gavrić could remember little more than that he and Poljo had gone to the home of a local teacher in Borike, Mile Balčaković.[166]

When Balčaković, his friend, called Gavrić that next day and asked him to pick up Poljo, he did not hesitate. Dr. Zoran Gavrić never returned from Borike. Ćamil Poljo had been murdered that previous night, and a few days later the lifeless body of Gavrić was identified in the Sokolac hospital. What exactly happened to him is still a mystery; the last that is known is that he went to Balčaković's house and together they went to the Borike Hotel, where Rajko Kušić and his irregulars were stationed.[167] There were few Serbs in Rogatica who shared Gavrić's strong beliefs—beliefs that compelled him to disobey SDS edicts regarding ethnic exclusivity and continue to socialize equally with all. Only a dozen or so Serbs attended Gavrić's burial, but hundreds of Bosniaks paid their respects.[168]

Unfortunately, there are not more than a handful of examples such as that of Zoran Gavrić. But Bosniaks from the village of Mađer, near Rogatica, can offer another. In early May 1992, Serbs from the neighboring village of Rasput Njive advised Mađer's Bosniaks to hide in the woods. Later, they met their Muslim neighbors in a hidden valley. "A group of villagers met us there. They told us not to leave the valley before dark, and not to enter their village in daylight, because you never knew who was watching and what their intentions were. They promised to take us to their village at night."[169] The Bosniaks spent nights in the Serb village, moving at dawn to a nearby forest, where the Serbs from Rasput Njive brought them food and blankets as they hid. Because these saviors were a minority among Serbs in the municipality of Rogatica, they were risking their own lives. One morning, one of them said to the hiding Bosniaks: "This morning, Serb forces told us not to interfere anymore, not to prevent them from fulfilling their duties. We cannot protect you anymore."[170]

Remembering these events fifteen years later, Borivoje Lelek, from the village of Rasput Njive, cannot say what made the Serbs from his village risk their own lives to protect their Bosniak neighbors. All he knows is that they would do it again. "We have always been on good terms with our Bosniak neighbors, even today. They returned, and so did we. Deep mutual respect exists among us."[171] The examples of Zoran Gavrić, Borivoje Lelek, and all the villagers of Rasput Njiva deserve without doubt to be the subjects of further study. Genocide analyses typically focus on perpetrators and their motives, rarely on what motivates people to assume the roles of saviors who prevent genocidal acts. It is their motives that could play a significant role in developing programs of genocide prevention.

FOČA: RAPE AS A TACTIC OF GENOCIDE

Comparing the history of genocides, it is obvious that in the process of exterminating a nation of people, bureaucracies implement a wide range of measures to achieve their end goal. Many genocides thus far have incorporated the rape of female members of the victim nation. Interestingly, a glaring exception is Nazi Germany, where the most extreme form of genocide was committed against Jews but did not include the systematic rape of Jewish women. According to the Nuremberg Laws of 1935, "racial mixing" between Germans and Jews was forbidden, and one could be sentenced to six months' imprisonment for "desecration of the race" if found to be in violation.[172] In most instances, though, systematic rape is part of a genocidal campaign, and reports from Sudan more recently have shown that this historical practice continues to be repeated.[173]

Genocides in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Rwanda in the late twentieth century have laid the ground for international judicial precedents, especially pertaining to the crime of rape. Sometimes during this process, decisions have not always run parallel. While the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda decided that rape is a genocidal crime, in the case of Foča it was treated as a crime against humanity. But Foča was a landmark nonetheless, as the case against Zoran Vuković, Radomir Kovač, and Dragoljub Kunarac was the first time in history that the combination of sexual enslavement and rape was treated as a crime against humanity and a violation of the rules of war.[174]

In Rwanda, in the first-instance judgment in the Jean-Paul Akayesu case,[175] rape was initially labeled a form of genocide. According to the judgment, rape can be treated as a genocidal crime if it was committed with the intent to kill a woman, to inseminate her with the seed of another ethnicity, or to traumatize the woman so much that she will never want to give birth again.[176] Although the prosecution at the tribunal for the former Yugoslavia did not characterize rapes in Bosnia and Herzegovina as a genocidal crime but presented them as a crime against humanity, the systematic and organized nature of the rape of Bosniak women was clearly part of the larger genocidal campaign to secure Serb territory in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Bakira Hasečić was raped in Višegrad in 1992. Her traumatic memories illustrate in the most ghastly way the meaning of the genocidal intent to "inseminate [a woman] with the seed of another ethnicity." Hasečić's rapist told her that Muslim women were being systematically raped "in order to be inseminated by the Serb seed."[177] Reports from different parts of Serb-held Bosnia and Herzegovina show a similar pattern throughout the aggression; the case of Foča illustrates that rape was part of a systematic, genocidal set of crimes committed with the aim of exterminating the Bosniak population.

The History of Rape as a War Crime, a Crime against Humanity, and a Weapon of Genocide

The crime of rape as a cruel weapon of war was not the exclusive invention of the Serbs or of the Rwandan Hutus. This attitude toward women in wartime is a consequence of a global patriarchal culture, which is tainted by extremist ideologies in the midst of warfare to even more poisonous effect. In numerous underdeveloped societies, a woman is a second-class citizen at best, even today; legacies that support this disparity are often those which societies find difficult to overcome. In the Babylonian Code of Hammurabi women were put in the same category as animals and property.[178] The laws of ancient Israel did not differ much from those in Babylon: a woman was always under the protection of either her father (as a valuable piece of property, assuming her virginity was intact) or her husband.[179] In ancient Greece, rape was a "socially acceptable behavior in warfare" among warriors, who considered a woman their "rightfully gained and legitimate prey, useful for marriage, as a concubine, as a slave, or as a war trophy."[180]

Alberico Gentili (1552–1608), a sixteenth-century lawyer, was one of the first to suggest that rape as warfare should be forbidden. A discussion on proper behavior in warfare developed under the influence of Enlightenment-era philosophers. Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712–1778) wrote that there was not a single justification for rape in war and that rape should be classified as a crime in all warfare laws. Various international treaties that formally adopted the principles and rules of war prior to World War I implicitly and explicitly forbade rape as a weapon of war. One of them was the Leibers Code of 1863, which uncompromisingly ordered severe punishment for the crime of rape. The Hague Convention of 1899 imposed protection of "family honor and rights" in warfare. Although it did not explicitly mention the crime of rape, it is clear that under protection from abuse and protection of family honor, the Hague Convention implied protection for women against rape in war.[181]

Despite these historical guidelines, World War I is remembered for both mass killing and mass rape. The rape of Belgian women by German soldiers was so widespread that it became a metaphor for Belgian national humiliation. The 1929 Geneva Convention's proclamation that "women shall be treated with all consideration due to their sex"[182] served its purpose poorly, with all the "awkwardness of a euphemism,"[183] and failed to prevent mass rape from recurring just a decade later. During World War II, among many other instances, tens of thousands of women were raped by Russian soldiers in Berlin during the last two weeks of the war.[184] Susan Brownmiller summarized the essence of rape in wartime as an emblem of militaristic might: "The body of a raped woman becomes a ceremonial battlefield, a parade ground for the victor's trooping of the colors. The act that is played out upon her is a message passed between men—vivid proof of victory for one and loss and defeat for the other."[185]

In order to characterize rape as a genocidal crime, it has to be committed with the intent to exterminate a nation or one of its parts. Soldiers rape when ordered to; also, hatred and the irrational wish for "revenge," amplified by propagandized myths, motivate them to act criminally. One such myth was proliferated by Bosnian Serb leader Biljana Plavšić, who justified the campaign of rape against Bosniak women this way: "Rape is, unfortunately, a warfare strategy of Muslims and some Croats in conflicts with Serbs. This is a normal thing in Islam, since it endorses polygamy. In the 500 years of the Turkish occupation, *beys* and *agas* had the right to take any bride and spend her wedding night with her. And also, according to the rules of Islam, a child inherits the father's nationality."[186] This rationalization—rape or let your mother and sisters be raped—was just one item in a campaign of misinformation led by Plavšić. She also asserted that Muslims were originally Serbs but had been spoiled by genetics, which allowed for their acceptance of conversion to Islam. According to Plavšić, this "bad" gene is condensed from generation to generation and is "becoming worse."[187]

Blame for the mass rape of Bosniak women should be directed not only at the Serb soldiers and policemen who wanted to inseminate Bosniaks but also at those who invented, ordered, and organized the project. Genocidal rapes are always a product of state politics, and in Bosnia and Herzegovina they were carried out as a part of a complex and well-organized genocidal plan that aimed to destroy the most basic of Bosniak values.

Systematic rape of Bosniak women was reported from the very beginning of the war. Stories of the first refugees from occupied parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina included horrific accounts of a network of camps for women in which they were habitually raped. However, the international community did not verify these stories until a group of medical experts visited the former Yugoslavia in mid-January 1993, nearly a year after the aggression began. The team interviewed a number of victims and witnesses of rape, and concluded that Serb forces were systematically raping Bosniak women but the Serb political and military leadership were making no effort to try to prevent these crimes.[188] Events in Foča, which began in April 1992, prove that the Serb leadership not only failed to prevent, but explicitly ordered, the organized rape of Bosniak women.

Déjà Vu in Foča

Genocide theoreticians like to remind us of the fact that genocide tends to be repeated. In Foča, as in Rogatica, the pattern of attack in 1992 was identical to that in World War II. According to records, Chetnik operations in the municipality of Foča in 1942 were aimed at the extermination of Muslims; Chetniks took control of Foča on August 19 of that year. The commander of the operation, Petar Baćović, informed his leader Draža Mihailović on August 20 that, "after having politically secured themselves from potential consequences, our troops, led by Mayor Ostojić, have, after a short and intense fight, taken control of Foča. Our losses—4 dead; the enemy's—around a 1,000, of which around 300 were women and children."[189] A number of wealthy Muslims lived in Foča, which, according to survivors, was the reason the massacre was followed by looting and the implementation of discriminatory measures. "The Chetniks took keys to all Muslim-owned shops, which was around 90 percent of the total number in Foča. They took all they found inside the shops to their military barracks, where they distributed the loot among themselves. They used the fabric to make Chetnik uniforms. Muslims were forbidden to leave their homes. Those who were allowed to do so were marked just like Jews [in Germany]."[190]

Archives reveal ghastly details of atrocities, yet almost exactly fifty years later, Serb ideology, this time even more monstrous in its intent, revisited Foča with a genocidal methodology starkly resembling that of the Chetniks in the Second World War. As in other towns and villages of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the SDS created a hostile, nationalistic atmosphere in Foča in the early 1990s. At the same time, the SDA, the majority Bosniak party, was not opposed to using propaganda itself, and the genocide against Bosniaks in World War II was highlighted by the SDA in the spring of 1990, when the party organized a rally and dedicated it to the Muslim victims of 1942. A naive promise was made that the Drina River would never flow with blood again.[191] But in the end, the SDA did little to defend Bosniaks when they needed protection two years later.

Investigations conducted by the ICTY, as well as judgments of its trial chambers, have proved beyond reasonable doubt that Bosniaks were unprepared for war and that their arming and military organization remained that of a weak resistance.[192] On the other hand, a great number of trial witnesses have confirmed that the arming of Serbs was conducted according to a premeditated plan, fully coordinated with the JNA and Serbian leadership. Serbs from Foča and the surrounding villages were issued weapons distributed from the JNA warehouse in Livade, a Serb-held territory.

A few months prior to the attack on Foča, the atmosphere was polarized. Bosniaks were aware of Serb activities aimed at preparation for war. Crisis Staffs for both Serbs and Muslims were established, and after the ultimatums and insistence of Serbs, government institutions were split between the two groups, with the new Serb institutions coordinated by Serb police forces that were led by the most prominent SDS members—Vojislav Maksimović, Velibor Ostojić, and Petko Čančar.

The occupation of Foča started on April 7, 1992. Before shelling the town with artillery from the surrounding hills, Serb Army forces set Muslim houses in Foča ablaze. Bosniaks exerted unorganized and spontaneous resistance. On April 8, the Serbs, supported by heavy artillery, attacked the remaining pockets of resistance in Foča and the vicinity.[193]

Just as in other occupied towns, the Bosnian Serb bureaucracy applied discriminatory measures against the non-Serb population that had not managed to leave Foča. Bosniaks ceased to receive their salaries, and many lost their jobs, including some hospital employees.[194] Numerous witnesses testified at the ICTY about having limited freedom of movement, a limited right to gather in groups, and even restrictions on basic communication. Serb Army forces easily disarmed the few armed Bosniaks in the villages around Foča by sending envoys who proposed alleged resolution of the conflict. The focus of these negotiations was always the “peaceful” role of the JNA.[195]

Despite the fact that Bosniak villages were being conquered with minimal or no resistance, Bosniaks were gathered and detained. According to the U.N. special envoy for human rights, mass executions of Bosniaks in Foča and its environs started as early as March. The case of the village of Jeleč, taken with no resistance at all, deserves special emphasis because the local (unarmed) men were executed and the women and children forcibly expelled into a nearby forest, returning four days later to bury their loved ones.[196] No resistance was exerted in the villages of Trnovača and Trbušće, south of Foča, either. Serb Army forces entered these villages in June 1992.[197] Without firing a single bullet or meeting any resistance themselves, Serb soldiers expelled Bosniaks from their homes at gunpoint and detained them in prisons and camps.[198]

Testimonies and records on the implementation of genocide in Foča require thorough analysis. The variety of crimes that constituted genocide against Bosniaks there included the destruction of Muslim monuments and facilities. Although the destruction of a nation's culture is not sanctioned as genocide by the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide of 1948, sociological theories maintain that it is a constituent part of any genocidal plan. Raphael Lemkin, who gave genocide its name, lobbied for sanctioning what he termed "culturocide" during the preparation of the Convention draft. He claimed that criminals, before they start burning bodies, burn books.[199] "Culturocide" was not included in the document due to a lack of political will, but it is evident in analysis of any genocidal process. Ravished mosques and the ruin of other Muslim cultural facilities testified to this in Bosnia. In the Foča region alone, as many as twenty mosques were destroyed, among them the famous Aladža Mosque, built in 1550, and Bosnia's oldest mosque, the Turhan Emin-bey Mosque, built in 1448.[200]

Concentration Camp Rapes in Foča

Concentration camps were established in Foča in early April 1992. A research document confirms that, between April 1992 and October 1994, 145 Serbs worked in the Foča prison. Most were employed as guards; however, some were listed as cooks, educators, warehouse workers, and more.[201] Prisoners at the Foča prison were from a wide geographical area, including Foča, Goražde, Čajnice, Ustikolina, Tjentište, Miljevina, and Jeleč. From 1992 to 1995, the number of detainees varied. It was usually between 350 and 500, but reached as high as 750.[202]

Some prisoners were forced to work,[203] while others were taken away and never heard from again.[204] Apart from forced labor, regular beatings, torture, and "disappearances," hygiene was minimal, detainees slept on the floor, and they received nutritionally poor meals. A protected ICTY witness, known as FWS-65, told the Trial Chamber that he lost forty kilograms (eighty-eight pounds) in four months as a detainee in the camp.[205]

In and around the town of Foča, a network of camps operated, in which Bosniak men were killed and Bosniak women were raped. The camps included:

Buk Bijela, the Foča high school complex, the high school in Kalinovik (3 kilometers west of Foča), Karaman's house (in Miljevina), Lepa Brena (a skyscraper in Foča), Partizan (a prewar sports hall), a house in Trnovače (2.5 kilometers south of Foča), and 16 Osmana Džikića Street (a military headquarters where women were raped).[206] In legal proceedings against Dragomir Kunarac, Radomir Kovač, and Zoran Vuković, women testified to the appalling serial rape they had been subjected to during their capture and stay in the camps, as well as in the houses, apartments, sports halls, and schools listed.[207]

Transcripts from The Hague and the State Court of Bosnia and Herzegovina hold the traumatic memories of women and girls willing to testify about the dark side of human nature—victims who bravely relived their past in order for justice to be achieved. Protected witness FWS-62, for one, described the rape of a woman that took place in the presence of other detainees, including her ten-year-old son.[208] Female victims across the region experienced similar horrors.[209]

Orders to Rape

Countless witnesses have claimed that the atrocities described above were ordered by Serb authorities and were supervised. Unfortunately, there is no documentary evidence of clear written orders issued at high political levels to rape Bosniak women. The inaction of Bosnian Serb authorities to prevent the widespread nature of these crimes, however, supports claims that rape against non-Serb women was planned and organized. Witness FWS-48 reported that some soldiers told him they had been ordered to rape their victims.[210] And, as Bakira Hasečić's rapist told her, Muslim women were being systematically raped "in order to be inseminated by the Serb seed."

ICTY testimony reveals that there was oversight of organized rape and that it occurred "in full view and with the knowledge of local authorities."[211] Protected witness FWS-192 testified that both the police chief and the SDS president in Kalinovik had come to inspect the high school in which women were being raped.[212] On their way from Buk Bijela to the high school, buses carrying victimized Bosniak women even stopped in front of the local police station. Soldiers from the bus talked with Foča police chief Dragan Gagović,[213] who was also seen by a number of witnesses at or near Partizan, where "the frequency of rapes and numbers of soldiers were even higher" than at the high school.[214] When they approached police asking for protection, the women were treated cruelly and their pleas were ignored.

Some Bosnian Serb soldiers did try to rein in their comrades. For instance, a guard at the Foča high school attempted to prevent soldiers from committing rape. Witness FWS-95 was present as the guard tried unsuccessfully to keep a group of soldiers from entering the school hall. The soldiers alleged that they held a document, signed by Dragan Gagović, permitting them to remove women from the hall because "soldiers needed to have sexual intercourse to improve their fighting spirit."[215] The soldiers artificially lifted their spirits as well; as Roy Gutman wrote: "According to the young women, the rapists discussed the assaults with their victims as a mission they had to accomplish. Many of the men fortified their resolve by taking white pills that appeared to stimulate them."[216]

Rape was conducted in the same way across all of occupied Bosnia and Herzegovina. Analysis of the manner in which mass rapes were organized reveals their common characteristics. Educated and wealthy women were raped first. Their own family members, imprisoned in the same camps, were often forced to commit incest by raping them. This campaign, simultaneously conducted in different parts of the country, constituted an element of the aggression. Much of the rape suffered by Bosniak women took place in official concentration camps,[217] and law professor Catharine MacKinnon has no doubt that Serb Army forces officially utilized rape as a means to their leadership's genocidal end: "It is rape unto death, rape as massacre, rape to kill and to make you leave your home and never want to go back. It is rape to be seen and heard and watched and told to others: rape as spectacle. It is rape to drive a wedge through a community, to shatter a society, to destroy a people. It is rape as genocide . . . rape as ethnic expansion through forced reproduction."[218]

Further proof that the rape of Bosniak women in Foča was organized by the Serb political and military leadership came in the case of Dragan Zelenović. On January 17, 2007, Zelenović pleaded guilty to the rape of Bosniak women in Buk Bijela, in Foča, including a fifteen-year-old girl. Zelenović also admitted to having raped numbers of women in the Foča Gymnasium, the Partizan sports hall, and Karaman's house, and to torturing, beating, and starving imprisoned women.[219] At one point in ICTY proceedings, the defense attorney clarified for the court the details of his client's postwar escape to Russia: "Mr. Zelenović was told to leave Foča. As he said, he came to the Republic of Serbia. . . . [I]n 2001, [he] went to the police station in Belgrade where documents were issued to him, a passport with a visa of the Russian Federation, and a personal identity card in the name of Branislav Petrović."[220] This confirms that Serbian authorities were not only involved in organizing the mass rape of Bosniak women, they continued to deny the crime and protect criminals long after the war.

Needless to say, Bosniak women have survived a most monstrous campaign; now, many feel compelled to tell the world of the pain they suffered. One of the reasons that rape was not codified by international law prior to the creation of the ICTY is that most victims of rape have been reticent to testify. Often, victims will even refuse to admit they have been raped, resulting in high numbers of unreported rapes in times of both war and peace. The bravery of victims to speak out—in a refusal to accept the irrational guilt imposed on them by a traditional patriarchal legacy—has led to the recognition of rape as an international war crime.

VIŠEGRAD: GENOCIDE AS A SOCIAL PROJECT

Each case study so far has demonstrated how the Bosnian Serb population in eastern Bosnia was, in a variety of ways, recruited to play a role in the Serb genocidal project. Germans, Austrians, Lithuanians, Poles, and others in whose name the Nazi state and its collaborators committed genocide against Jews, Roma, and many more throughout Europe reacted similarly. The members of many nations have lacked immunity to genocidal indoctrination, allowing it to numb their collective consciousness to the extent that they have either tacitly endorsed genocide or participated in it.[221] Yet there are few such painfully illustrative examples of this participation in the most brutal of genocidal methods and mass killings as those from the town of Višegrad in 1992. The genocide in Višegrad lasted for days and was witnessed by the local population, including Serb women, the elderly, and children—much of it took place on the bridge over the Drina, which can be seen from almost every window in town. Worse yet, Bosniaks were executed in the streets in broad daylight, and Serb Army forces burned people alive in their homes. To what extent did Bosnian Serbs in Višegrad have to endorse this genocidal spree, or participate in it, for it to be successful?

History and Geostrategy

The municipality of Višegrad is located in the southeast corner of Bosnia and Herzegovina, just miles from the border with Serbia. From the First Serbian Uprising in 1804, Višegrad has been targeted by Serbian revolutionaries, and not a single conflict since then has circumvented this region. The greatest suffering of Višegrad's Muslims came during World War II, when more than five thousand died. In October 1943 alone, Draža Mihailović's Chetniks killed around fifteen hundred Bosniaks at the bridge on the Drina River.[222] Besides killing people at the bridge, Chetniks used the monstrous method of burning whole families alive in their homes. Šemso Tucaković writes that "in Višegrad Municipality, which was hit by the Chetnik's 'nationalist politics' in late 1941, the terror was exceptionally intensive the following autumn and winter. In Bosniak villages, in the valley of the Lim, Rzav and Drina Rivers. . . . People were being apprehended while on the run or in their homes, and forced into houses or stables. Straw would be placed inside and the houses set ablaze. Thousands of women, children and elderly people died in tremendous pain."[223] Tucaković, who reviewed numerous documents and testimonies, found that Chetniks had raped girls and young women. Dušan Golubović, a Chetnik from the village of Šahdan, "excelled" in these crimes; in the vicinity of the Lim River, he ambushed fifty refugees from Sandžak and forced them into the river, "where they all drowned."[224]

There is practically no record of the World War II–era suffering of Bosniaks from Višegrad. The Yugoslav state put significant effort into erasing unpleasant collective memories. The term "Chetnik" was replaced with "revolutionary," and a number of Chetniks from Višegrad acquired a right to pensions and disability pay for their participation in an alleged war for liberation.[225] This lack of sanctions for crimes committed in World War II is seen as one of the reasons why Serb Army forces repeated an almost identical genocidal scenario in eastern Bosnia in 1992.

Because of its geostrategic position, Višegrad has consistently been seen as important in the realization of plans for a Greater Serbia. It lies on the Drina River—just south of where the Drina no longer forms the Serbian border—several miles from Serbia. It is along the route that connects Belgrade and Titovo Užice in Serbia with Goražde and Sarajevo in Bosnia and Herzegovina. For the Užice Corps of the Yugoslav People's Army, this route represented a vital link with the command in Uzamnica, as well as other locations of strategic importance in the conflict.[226] Another reason for Višegrad's importance is its dam. The dam produces electricity but, more important, it controls the level of the Drina, managing flooding of areas downstream.

The Arming of Serbs and the Role of the Yugoslav People's Army

In 1991, the municipality of Višegrad numbered twenty-one thousand inhabitants, with nine thousand in the town itself. Bosniaks, at 63 percent, were a majority, and the remaining 33 percent of the population was Serb.[227] The first ethnic tensions appeared with the distribution of seats in the Municipal Assembly; Serb politicians felt they were underrepresented in the government.[228] As in many other towns in Bosnia and Herzegovina, military training and arming of Bosnian Serbs commenced.[229]

In early 1992, Bosniaks in Višegrad were disarmed or asked to surrender their weapons. The situation began to deteriorate on April 4, 1992, when Serb politicians started to demand a division of the police force on ethnic grounds. Serb forces soon placed barricades around the town. Poorly armed Bosniaks in surrounding villages followed suit, setting up their own barricades. The shelling of Bosniak settlements followed; fearing for their lives, most civilians fled.[230]

On April 13, 1992, Bosniak Murat Šabanović made a desperate attempt to blackmail the JNA by taking control of the dam on the Drina and threatening to release water. The next day, April 14, the JNA's Užice Corps entered Višegrad. They brought heavy arms and advised the local population to return to their homes, claiming their safety would then be guaranteed.

While a great number of Bosniaks fled fearing the intent of the Užice Corps, the presence of the corps had a calming effect on those who chose to remain in Višegrad. JNA officers invited local Bosniak leaders to join them in a media campaign advising people to return to their homes. In late April, a number of Muslims who had fled returned. Serb efforts to portray an ostensibly peaceful mission went so far as to include the initiation of negotiations between Bosniaks and Serbs in Višegrad, in an alleged attempt to ease tensions.

Having calmed Bosniak fears, however, Serb Army forces were able to implement their real mission: the cleansing of Bosniaks. Many thousands of civilians from the surrounding villages were brought to Višegrad's football stadium. People were searched for arms. A commander told them that those who lived on the west bank of the Drina River could return to their villages, which had been cleansed of "reactionary forces," while those from the right bank were not allowed to return.[231] Between May 18 and May 25, the Užice Corps pulled out of Višegrad, leaving the town in the hands of the White Eagles—a paramilitary force led by Milan Lukić—and Vojislav Šešelj's troops, known as *Šešeljevci* or Šešelj's men. Officially, the JNA withdrew from Višegrad on May 19, 1992, in reaction to U.N. Security Council Resolution 752, passed four days earlier, which called for the JNA to stop interfering in events in Bosnia and Herzegovina.[232]

The special forces that remained in the region—carefully labeled "paramilitary" by Serbian propaganda to maintain the public perception that these forces were not under state control—grew in number following the withdrawal of the JNA.[233] In coordination with local Serb forces, these groups stepped up their genocidal campaign against Bosniak civilians,[234] led by Milan Lukić's notoriously vicious unit.[235] Bosniaks who remained in Višegrad were "trapped, disarmed, and at the mercy of" Serb Army forces who were acting on orders to create ethnically pure Serb territories.[236] In June 1992, the killing intensified. Just one of the many crimes recorded in ICTY documents took place on June 7, 1992, when Lukić, along with Mitar Vasiljević and two more men, took seven Muslims to the bank of the Drina and killed five of them.[237]

A River of Corpses

Neither indictments nor judgments from the ICTY, which focused primarily on individual crimes, authentically captured the general atmosphere of killing and death that was pervasive in Višegrad. According to U.N. reports, information detailing executions in Višegrad was being received in real time. Unfortunately, the international community decided not to intervene. One Bosniak woman from Višegrad claims to have stood by her window for thirty-six hours in mid-April 1992 watching Serb forces kill people, unremittingly, at the bridge. Victims were either pushed from the bridge and shot while in the water, or killed on the bridge and then pushed into the river. Serb forces kept bringing groups of people; one group was executed and then another arrived, in intervals of sixty to ninety minutes.[238] "Mass killings [took place] in all parts of the town, its streets, houses, but most often at the Mehmed-paša Sokolović Bridge [the Old Bridge] and the Novi Most [the New Bridge]. . . . In just one day, on June 19, 1992, 147 Muslims were killed and thrown into the Drina from the New Bridge. The Old Bridge in Višegrad was the place where the most slaughter occurred, just as in the summer of 1943. Murders of Bosniaks at bridges were constant and numerous. The Drina River swallowed up the Muslims, but regurgitated their bodies as evidence in the village of Slap near Žepa. Bosniaks, most of whom were those who had fled the Višegrad region, gathered these bodies and buried them properly. Unfortunately, a lot of the buried have never been identified."[239]

Fehida D. was another Bosniak woman who, from her balcony, watched Milan Lukić remove people from the trucks that ferried Muslim victims: "We saw them by day or by the city lights, whether they were killing men that time, women or children. It took half an hour, sometimes more."[240] At the end of June, according to the research of award-winning *Guardian* journalist Ed Vulliamy, Višegrad police inspector Milan Josipović received a "macabre complaint" from the management of a hydropower plant in Bajina Bašta, downriver in Serbia. The plant's director requested that "whoever was responsible please slow the flow of corpses down the Drina. They were clogging up the culverts in his dam at such a rate that he could not assemble sufficient staff to remove them."[241]

Reading original Bosniak testimonies and listening to survivors' stories is an eerie experience. Most Bosnian Serbs from Višegrad have kept quiet to this day. But on November 7, 2008, one Bosnian Serb decided to break the unspoken code of silence. Sitting in a restaurant on the bank of the Drina, he lit his cigarette with a trembling hand and pointed toward the Mehmed-paša Sokolović Bridge. "That bridge is the biggest graveyard. A fortune-teller from Smederevo told me never to cross it, and if I did, to light a candle." He took a sip of coffee and continued while looking toward the river. "Two hundred bodies floated in the river. They wouldn't sink until they had decayed. When Lukić was killing, every day at exactly the same time the artificial lake was emptied, so the river would take the bodies away. On one August day, I went to the lake. It was filled with bodies."[242]

Burning People Alive

On June 14, 1992, local Serbs from Lukić's special unit gathered more than sixty Muslim civilians who were fleeing Koritnik and Sase in a house on Pionirska (Pioneer) Street in Višegrad. They set the house ablaze and shot at those who tried to escape through windows; in the end all but six people were burned alive.[243] Another genocidal act with precisely the same profile occurred two weeks later, when seventy-two civilians were set on fire at Meho Aljić's house in Bikavac. Most of them were women, children, and elderly people. Milan Lukić, along with his cousin Sredoje Lukić and Mitar Vasiljević, as well as others, were again responsible for this awful crime.[244]

The killing in Višegrad reached its peak in June and July 1992. Of all the people who went missing in the municipality in 1992, 62 percent disappeared in these two months alone; almost all of them were civilians.[245] The pattern and the dynamics of the killings in Višegrad were identical to those in neighboring municipalities. The majority of Bosniaks who had not already fled were systematically expelled in an organized manner. Convoys of buses, often escorted by the police, were used to transport Muslim residents.[246] Displacement of Bosniaks frequently included dispossession of their identification documents and any valuables. Some people were later exchanged for Serb prisoners, while others were tortured and killed. Sometimes, Muslims were taken into custody from places other than their homes. On October 22, 1992, a group of fifteen men and one woman from Sjeverin were forced off a bus headed to Priboj, in the village of Mioče. They were taken to the Vilina Vlas Hotel, where they were subjected to brutal torture before being executed on the bank of the Drina.[247]

Every mosque in and around Višegrad was burnt down.[248] Bosniaks who weren't executed at the Drina were tortured in concentration camps. In Vilina Vlas, a hotel just seven kilometers from town that served as one of the most infamous camps, Bosniak women were raped in large numbers. Muslim men and women were also tortured and killed at the following places: Hasan Veletovac primary school, Petar Kočić primary school, Uzamnica army barracks, the Bikavac Hotel, the Višegrad fire station, Višegrad high school, the local hydro electric plant, and the Varda furniture plant. More were tortured and beaten to death in the former Višegrad police station and in Meho Aljić's house in Bikavac.[249] By the end of 1992, only a handful of non-Serbs remained in Višegrad, and today's population is mostly Serb.[250] Such drastic reversals of ethnic composition were seen all across the territory that is now Republika Srpska. But Višegrad saw the second biggest change in population, after Srebrenica.[251]

Genocidal Ideology and Medicine

The atmosphere of fear that permeated Višegrad was demonstrated by the behavior of the town's medical doctors, who denied care to injured and ill non-Serbs. One such incident was brought to light in ICTY proceedings against Mitar Vasiljević. Having survived an incendiary attack in Bikavac, a young Bosniak woman, with life-threatening and disfiguring burn wounds and in unbearable pain, entered the police station in Višegrad and begged the policemen there to kill her. One reached for his gun to do so, but his younger colleague, shaken by the sight, took the girl to the nearby house of four elderly Serb women. He went to the local hospital for help and returned with Dr. Radomir Vasiljević, who rudimentarily treated the girl but "didn't dare take her to the health center" because he "couldn't guarantee her safety there."[252] The only advice he offered for follow-up treatment was that the girl walk over nearby mountains and frontlines to find a hospital in (Bosniak-held) Međeđa, where she could be safely treated.[253] When the prosecutor questioned Dr. Vasiljević's medical principles during his testimony, quizzing the doctor on the ethics of advising a patient to walk two hours by foot for life-saving care, Vasilijević maintained that paramilitary formations controlled the road to Užice. He further explained that bands of paramilitary forces visited the health center "sometimes as many as two or three times a day";[254] he insisted that the case "touched [him] deeply as a human being and as a doctor, because [he] was in a no-win situation," and said, "there was nothing else . . . that I could have done. Had I taken her to the health center, today I might be held responsible for her possible death."[255]

Both Dr. Vasiljević and Živorad Savić, an ambulance driver, testified that it was dangerous for doctors to provide medical care to Muslims. But in the spring and summer of 1992 it became common for medical staff in Višegrad to openly refuse to treat Bosniaks. Women's rights activist Bakira Hasečić offered some examples of doctors who had not only denied treatment to Bosniaks but openly expressed hatred toward them: "One day, a woman who had survived the house-burning on Pionirska Street came to us and we immediately called the Emergency Room. Doctor D. K. answered the phone. I explained what had happened and asked for an ambulance. These were her exact words: 'We have no vehicles for you *Balijas*' [a pejorative term for Muslims]."[256]

The doctor in question gladly agreed to an interview with me.[257] She denied all accusations, explaining that she had worked in the ER and that "the only patients coming to [her] had been Serbs."[258] When asked whether she knew of the crimes committed against Bosniak civilians in the spring and summer of 1992, she replied: "I honestly knew nothing about that. I never heard about crimes against Bosniaks. Believe me, I did not hear anything until after the war."[259] The Mehmed-paša Sokolović Bridge and the Drina River were painted in Bosniak blood, and houses were burning in and around Višegrad with the cries of people inside. Bearing this in mind—the magnitude of the genocide—it simply seems impossible that the doctor was unaware of what was occurring. After all, the genocidal process was not happening behind closed doors; around three thousand Bosniaks were killed in Višegrad and the surrounding area, and hundreds of Muslims, of all ages, have been exhumed from mass graves in the municipality.

A year and a half after the interview with Dr. D. K., one Serb from Višegrad was willing to admit that the mass killings had been, in a way, a public performance. He commented on the reasons people from his town refused to discuss it: "Everyone knew. It was impossible not to know. Bosniaks were being killed in immense numbers, in daylight, at night, in front of all of us. Serbs who were not directly involved in the killings are keeping silent, because they have all profited from it. Some got jobs, others participated in looting. There is nobody I can talk to about this. They just look at it differently."[260]

In March 1996, *Guardian* journalist Ed Vulliamy visited Višegrad in search of regret among Serbs for crimes committed against Bosniaks during the war several years earlier. He found none. He visited the Ivo Andrić library, where he met librarian Stojka Mijatović, who, in the spirit of good hospitality, gave him a book by Nobel Prize–winning writer Ivo Andrić. "We took so many books from Muslim houses we hardly know what to do with them," she said. As she handed him the book, she noticed a dedication containing a Muslim name and asked, "Would you like me to cross out this Muslim name?"[261]

Even today, when mass graves of Bosniak remains are revealed, there is no discernible regret among Višegrad's Serbs. Višegrad is a town to which displaced people and refugees have not returned since the Dayton Peace Accords. Bosniaks who survived the genocide there remember the hatred of their Serb neighbors; neighbors who, in the best case, turned their heads away then and now. "In total, three people have returned to the town of Višegrad, a young couple and an old lady. People are not returning both because of the trauma they went through and the absence of regret among Serbs for their atrocities. Even today, when I am visiting, they insult and harass me," remarked Bakira Hasečić.[262]

It seems that the aim of Serb nationalist propaganda, analyzed in chapter 2, was fully realized in Višegrad both in World War II and in the 1992–1995 aggression. Documentation reveals that both Serb men and women there participated in the genocide against Bosniaks in a variety of ways. They were ordinary workers, doctors, teachers, and librarians. Testimonies of Bosniaks, foreign humanitarian workers, journalists, ICTY investigators, and Serbs themselves have described the process of genocide against Bosniaks that occurred in the spring and summer of 1992. Furthermore, because Serbs have done nothing to mitigate the results of that genocide over the past two decades, and because there are no longer Bosniaks in Višegrad, the process of genocide is still at work in the town.

SREBRENICA: FORCED FAMINE AND "SLOW-MOTION GENOCIDE"

Historically, deliberately induced famine has often been used with genocidal intent, and is routinely accompanied by siege and the enforcement of inhumane living conditions. Placing towns under siege—exhausting the enemy—was once a widespread method of warfare. In the 1992–1995 aggression against Bosnia and Herzegovina, the most severe example of this methodology was the siege and famine imposed by Serb Army forces on the population of Srebrenica. Numerous evidentiary documents, videos, and audio recordings presented in ICTY proceedings confirm that the goal of the Srebrenica siege was the complete extermination of the civilian population. Inhabitants faced an array of risks, beyond famine, and also died of contagious disease or were killed by sniper bullets, by grenades, and in minefields.

Interviews, and abundant documentation, illustrate further that Srebrenica was not merely a town under siege but was essentially a vast concentration camp. The callous imposition of such atrocious living conditions has been recognized as a method of genocide by the Convention on Genocide. Article II, item c), specifies that genocide includes the deliberate infliction of a (lack of) quality of life calculated to bring about a group's physical destruction in whole or in part. The following pages focus on the genocidal intent of Serb forces in Srebrenica, the use of man-made famine as a genocidal method, the psychology of genocide victims, and how it is possible to fight against genocidal intent.

Famine as a genocidal method is found in a number of cases throughout history, but the famine inflicted on people in Ukraine by the Soviet government in 1932 and 1933 constitutes one of the most infamous examples. The Soviets imposed the famine following a Ukrainian nationalist renaissance, and many authors who have researched the case claim that those parts of Ukraine where ethnic Russians were a majority were exempt.[263] Testimony by a twelve-year-old Ukrainian girl demonstrates how the genocidal famine impacted children. "My father, mother and grandmother all died within two weeks. I was left alone in our house. I was 12. What was I to do? There was nothing to eat. I would go out early in the morning and wander through orchards until late at night looking for anything, any grass or couch grass; it was not easy to find food, because I was not the only one looking for it. I used to eat linden tree leaves. They were bitter, but good enough; I would sometimes find wild sorrel and eat it. My diet was, basically, like a goat's."[264]

In the Ottoman Empire, forced famine was one of the genocidal methods used against Armenian refugees. Lines of hungry Armenians were deported under armed escort from Anatolia in 1915. Squads of Ottoman mercenaries frequently changed the direction in which people walked, taking them off the main roads and onto mountain paths so that they had to dispose of all unnecessary baggage in order to keep moving, including all of their food supplies.[265] "When the measures to transport the entire population into the desert were adopted, no appropriations were made for any kind of nourishment. On the contrary, it is obvious that the government pursued a plan to let the people die of starvation," writes historian Richard Hovannisian.[266] In combination with other methods, intentional and planned starvation was also used by the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia from 1975 to 1979. Concentration camp detainees there got as little as two hundred grams of rice a day, and guards were known to say: "Those of you who have the habit of eating until full, it is your turn to be hungry."[267] Demographer Marek Sliwinski estimates that 36 percent of victims in Cambodia died as a result of the imposed famine.[268] Photographs of skeletal captives in World War II concentration camps confirm that famine was also used in the genocide against Jews. Eerily similar television images of Bosniaks in concentration camps, broadcast in the summer of 1992, offered the first proof that Serb forces were replicating history.

Concentration camps have, without exception, been established in all recorded genocides to date. The English term "concentration camp" was eventually introduced to describe the camps used by the British in the Anglo-Boer War of 1899–1902; but it was camps set up by the Spanish Army during the Ten Years' War in Cuba from 1868 to 1878, called *reconcentrados*, that originally gave life to the term. Concentration camps are used to achieve the mass imprisonment of a civilian population and the torture of its members through various means. Camps have generally been established with the intent that a large proportion of detainees will die, as in the case of the Soviet Gulag. In World War II, Nazi authorities expertly used concentration camps to exterminate Jews, Roma, and members of a number of other groups. Similar genocidal methods have been used in most concentration camps, with the death of detainees usually caused by torture and/or starvation. Nazi camps differed, introducing new levels of atrocity that resulted from what has been called the "industrialization of death."[269]

The inability of victims to exert any resistance is a criterion used by many to define genocide. In other words, the popular conception of genocide assumes that victims are unable to defend themselves. Helen Fein, who has often criticized the passive attitude of the international community toward genocide, argues that a victim's resistance has often justified noninvolvement by the international community because the argument can be made that "crimes are being committed by all parties."[270] She further criticizes adherence to the paradigm in which genocide requires an innocent victim and a culpable perpetrator with the aim to exterminate all members of a group. Jews in World War II are commonly presented as stereotypical innocent victims who did not defend themselves. The obedience of Jews to the Nazi system is currently the topic of numerous debates among Jews themselves, but also of research analyzing victim psychology. The most frequently asked question on the issue is: How could only a few camp guards successfully control thousands of people who knew they were going to die? What is difficult to explain is that, even though they were well aware that they could not avoid death, most Jews obediently met their end with little to no resistance. Of course, there were exceptions to this rule, as there always are, as well as stories of detainees who escaped the camps.

The most well-known insurgence of Jewish resistance took place in the Warsaw ghetto. Ghettos were established by the Nazis across occupied Europe as a way to control Jews and other minorities, and often operated as de facto concentration camps, just as Srebrenica did fifty years later. Theoreticians usually account for the predominant passivity of Jews in the ghetto with the thesis that this was believed to be their best choice: "As long as Jews thought they could survive the Nazi rule and the war, they could see an incentive to re-enact the modes of passive conduct that in the past had tended to insure the survival of the community, and they were accordingly reluctant to engage in armed resistance."[271] The Warsaw ghetto uprising was not a lone example of Jewish resistance, though. In his research, Yehuda Bauer offers a long list of insurgencies and armed operations, and tells of seventeen places in Poland from which Jews escaped in an organized manner to join guerrilla forces. Bauer also describes open rebellions against Nazi guards in six concentration camps, including the late 1944 rebellion in an Auschwitz gas chamber.[272]

Self-organized resistance was also the practical consequence of imposed famine in Srebrenica. Serb propaganda often uses this self-organization of Bosniaks, and their defense of Srebrenica, as justification for the July 1995 tragedy there, which was a culmination of the genocidal process in Bosnia. The ensuing sections examine some of the means by which Bosniaks in Srebrenica, as victims of genocide, defended themselves.

The Prewar Atmosphere

In September 1991, when Džemo Jusić and Nedžad Hodžić were killed in the village of Kravice, ethnic tensions grew markedly in a short time. Muslims, fearful, avoided Serb-populated areas.[273] Bosniaks at the country's military and political institutions had serious indications that preparations for armed aggression were under way. Building of an alternative transportation network started as early as 1990 when "the JNA constructed the foundation for a passage for tanks to enter Bosnia and Herzegovina from Serbia along the riverbed of the Drina River. The passage was in the Bratunac municipality, in Redžići and Dubrave. In these villages and in Fakovići, foundations were laid for the construction of a pontoon bridge."[274] This alternative network was used by Serb Army forces for the transportation of tanks, heavy artillery, and other weapons. Sidik Ademović had firsthand information about the early arming of Serbs because he worked for the police force. He explained that "the police were not given the right to supervise those roads, but the JNA was."[275] Suad Smailović, another resident, elaborated on the causes of tensions in the municipality of Srebrenica: "Kravica was flooded with armed people. We knew trucks loaded with arms were arriving at Kravica from the direction of Ljubovija, Krasanpolje, and Zelinje. A unit of the Serb police had already been established in late 1991. According to what we knew, Serbs entered in April 1992 fully armed and ready. There were plenty of incidents already occurring, especially in the border area close to Serbian villages."[276]

As early as November 1991, armed and uniformed soldiers could be seen patrolling the streets of Srebrenica. If police questioned them, they would show their JNA authorization, which gave them the freedom to collect food and other necessities for Croatian refugees and also guaranteed their unimpeded movement. Intensive arming of Serbs in villages around Srebrenica started publicly in the second half of 1991, and was witnessed by Bosniaks. "We knew the JNA was arming the local population. Helicopters were dropping weapons over Dučići, where general Milenko Živanović owned a house. From there, they transported the weapons to Fakovići, Pribićevac, and to the Loznica River," Smailović claims.[277]

The fate of Srebrenica was interwoven with the fate of all of eastern Bosnia, but the coordination of events in Srebrenica was most closely linked to the fate of Bratunac. On April 17, 1992, representatives from Srebrenica were invited to a meeting in Bratunac at which a request was made that the Srebrenica Ministry of Internal Affairs be divided (along ethnic lines), as well as the town of Srebrenica itself. The Križevica River was the proposed border. Pressured by the presence of armed soldiers from Arkan's unit, municipal representatives agreed to the division of Srebrenica and the ministry, along with ordering all police stations to resign their weapons to the Serb police.[278] When they heard about the surrender of arms, several Bosniak policemen secured some from a police warehouse. Naser Orić, Suad Smailović, Hakija Meholjić, Akif Ustić, Sidik Ademović, and many other Bosniaks who refused to surrender their weapons to Serb forces went into the surrounding hills. According to Smailović, these men "immediately evacuated the population, because [they] had heard about the killings in Bratunac."[279] As Bosniaks collected in the hills, ad hoc guerrilla units were formed. These unconnected and self-organized groups were the essence of spontaneous resistance throughout 1992 and 1993.[280]

On April 13, 1992, two Bosniaks returning from Bajina Basta were killed near Kravica.[281] Four days later, on April 17, Srebrenica was divided and then attacked. Kravica, a Serb village, played a special role leading up to the war in the agitation of nationalist tensions and the arming of Serbs in the region. Once the military isolation of Srebrenica began, Kravica maintained a central position, as shellfire from the Serb villages around Srebrenica—with the heaviest shelling coming from Kravica, Ježestica, Ratkovići, Fakovići, Bjelovac, and Sase—held the town and its tens of thousands of refugees under siege.

As the attack began and residents of Srebrenica fled, the first Serb soldiers entered the town from Zalazje, a Sase mine, where a concentration camp had already been established. The next day, more Serb forces entered Srebrenica, and then Arkan's men arrived. Terror was inflicted upon any Bosniaks who remained. The central mall was entered by force and looted, Bosniak houses were set on fire, and many were killed.[282] From her fifth-floor window, Sabra Kolenović watched her Serb neighbors don olive green uniforms and, along with the newly arrived Serb forces, burn Bosniak houses and loot Srebrenica. One day, they broke into her apartment and claimed they were looking for a sniper: "They kicked the door open and entered. They started beating me and my children. Elvis was eight and Anel twelve. I have no idea how we managed to survive. Our neighbors did not even try to help us."[283]

Just days after Serb Army forces arrived in Srebrenica, all Bosniak houses had been burnt down, and any Bosniaks who had remained in the town had been killed. Goran Zekić, president of the SDS in Srebrenica and one of the key organizers of the aggression in the region, participated in the shelling and burning of Bosniak villages near Kragljivode and Skenderovići on May 7 and 8. While returning to Srebrenica, he was killed in an ambush.[284] Zekić's execution brought about the withdrawal of Serb forces, who took all they could carry when they left Srebrenica. Suad Smailović, "When we noticed they had left Srebrenica, a group of people and I immediately descended to the town. Everything was gone. We did not allow people to return the first few days, because we did not know what was going on. Five days later, we sent people hiding in the hills to Kazani. We found some weapons in the local police station. We brought the refugees staying in the woods back home. We lacked enough apartments and houses for all the residents and refugees, so around May 25 we started putting refugees into Serb houses. People would usually find weapons there, which helped us to survive."[285]

Large groups of refugees expelled from their homes all over eastern Bosnia began to arrive in Srebrenica, around ten thousand people in only a few days. The population grew constantly. Independent sources estimated varying numbers, but some claimed that the town's population grew from forty thousand in December 1992 to eighty thousand in March 1993.[286]

In late May 1992, armed Bosniaks were ramping up attempts to organize. It was a challenge to establish order and protect the hungry and exhausted people who continued to arrive from throughout the region. By exchanging the uncertain protection provided by the forest for Srebrenica, and joining their compatriots, people believed their chances for survival were increasing. They were not aware that by entering Srebrenica they were entering a trap envisaged by the architects of the Serb genocidal campaign. Srebrenica was shelled by Serbs on a daily basis, the town was surrounded by minefields, and Serb infantry guarded all exits to free territory. They also controlled the food supply. Many Bosniaks died in minefields while looking for food, or were killed by snipers or grenades. Many ended up in concentration camps such as Sušica or Karakaj. From May 1992 onward, the population of Srebrenica consisted mostly of people from *other* towns and villages. In March 1993, Larry Hollingworth from the U.N. High Commission for Refugees told a press conference that Serb Army forces had "chased innocent women and children from village to village, until finally they are cornered in Srebrenica, a place from which there is no escape, and where their fate is to be transported like cattle or slaughtered like lambs."[287]

RESISTANCE AND "ACTIONS FOR FOOD"

The early months of Bosniak guerrilla activities, which took Serb forces by surprise, determined the longer-term defense strategy of Bosniaks in Srebrenica. After the withdrawal of Serb forces from Srebrenica following Zekić's death, leaders of self-organized Muslim groups met in Bajramovići on May 20, 1992. The question on the table was how these disparate groups could help each other in their shared fight against Serb troops.[288] Pressured by the town's hungry population, Srebrenica defenders joined to attack Serb villages in guerrilla operations known as "actions for food." These attacks occurred from June 1992 to March 1993 and provided manifold benefits as defenders obtained both food and weapons, but they also neutralized Serb military strongholds from which Serb Army forces, aided by artillery, were holding Srebrenica under siege.

Srebrenica defenders were under tremendous pressure from the hungry people who organized daily protests in front of the War Presidency building, asking for deliveries of food to be secured. Many Srebrenicans claim that the excruciating hunger they experienced far outweighed any fear of grenades or sniper bullets. Mesud Omerović, a judge from Srebrenica, felt the consequences of the famine and remembers the winter of 1992–1993 as one of the most dreadful experiences of his life. "I was hungry. I received a small bag of walnuts from my friends. It was a small amount and I decided to eat them slowly. Every day when I was getting ready to go to work, I would put one walnut in my pocket. And then, while at work, I would wait for the right moment to eat it. One day, two old women arrived in Srebrenica. They were Croats from Rogatica, also expelled by the Serbs. They seemed to be starving. I gave one of them the walnut that was going to be my meal at work."[289]

Serb Army forces did not allow U.N. convoys to deliver food to Srebrenica, so the only source of food was surrounding villages, most of which were Serb military strongholds. Food could be acquired from those villages only with the loss of human lives. None of the actions for food remained a secret, so each one was characterized by the loss of civilian lives, as civilians often entered villages even before an operation had officially commenced.[290] In each operation, the defenders left the enemy a way out. "We were always very careful not to inflict significant losses. We wanted our operations to take as few lives as possible."[291]

A great number of refugees who participated in actions for food testified to the despair of hungry people during the operations, especially in the winter of 1992. Witnesses have told of how starving people would lose their mind when they knew food was within their reach.[292] Their lives ceased to be important; all that mattered was obtaining food. Sabra Kolenović described the grueling atmosphere in Srebrenica that winter, which brought misery to so many. “It was appalling. Srebrenica looked surreal. From my window I watched people living in the streets, in cardboard boxes, tents, and the like. Whenever they managed to find some wood, they would make a fire to get warm.” The anguish was felt by all, even by those who had a roof over their head, and even by children. In one action for food, Sabra Kolenović came face-to-face with the twelve-year-old son she thought she had left in their apartment. She explained, “He had been hungry for days. Even today, I can see him sitting at the kitchen table, holding his head in his hands, with big tears pouring down his face. He would never tell me he was hungry. He would just sit there, crying silently. The following day, I joined people from the town in an operation in Kravica. I sneaked out of the house early. My son joined the file of people heading toward Kravica without my knowledge.”[293]

Slavoljub Žikić, a Serb from the village of Fakovići, watched the start of a Bosniak action for food from a shelter in his village on October 5, 1992. He testified at the ICTY that the starving people who came to Fakovići took anything edible from his village, paying absolutely no attention to the ongoing shelling that put them in peril. He contended that no army in the world could have stopped the people he observed desperately looking for food. He told the court, “I think a civilized nation may find it very difficult to understand what I’m telling you” but “I understand [their behavior] fully.”[294]

The Serb Strategy of Induced Famine

The genocidal intent of Serb military and political leadership was evident long before July 1995, when genocide against Bosniaks culminated. Early and public admissions of their macabre goals, such as Radovan Karadžić’s threat of the disappearance of Bosniaks in the Assembly of the Serb Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina on October 14, 1991,[295] were reflected in the original directives of the Republika Srpska Army (VRS) from November 1992. Directive No. 4, issued on November 19, 1992, laid out the goal of the Bosnian Serb forces to: “launch offensive operations to crush large HVO [Croatian Defense Council] and Muslim groupings in the territory of the Republika Srpska and to force them into unconditionally surrendering their weapons, or destroy them.”[296] November 24, 1992, was marked as the beginning of such an offensive. In this same document, the goals of the Drina Corps were articulated: “From its present location its main forces shall persistently defend Višegrad (the dam), Zvornik and the corridor, while the remaining forces will exhaust the enemy in the wider Podrinje region, inflict the heaviest possible losses, and force them to leave the Birač, Žepa and Goražde areas together with the whole Muslim population. Prior to this, forces are to offer the able-bodied, armed men surrender. If they refuse—destroy them. Further, unblock the Milići, Konjević Polje-Zvornik route, and be prepared for intense fighting against commandos, terrorists and paramilitary troops, which are prone to ambushing."[297]

This document, issued in November of 1992, marks the first clear military order by the Bosnian Serb leadership for genocide in the Birač, Žepa, and Goražde regions. In an amendment to this directive, issued on December 7, 1992, Ratko Mladić ordered that all the goals of the VRS were to be achieved by December 13, 1992, so that the Republika Srpska leadership could announce a unilateral ceasefire. He claimed that, by transporting food supplies through Serb territories, the international community was trying to cause a conflict between the VRS and the local Serb population, creating conditions ripe for military intervention by Western countries.[298] Supplying threatened Bosniak-held regions with humanitarian relief was contrary to Serb political interests, which were centered on the goal of wearing people down so that they would either surrender or succumb to being destroyed. In the spring of 1995, Radovan Karadžić explicitly asserted genocidal intent by ordering that Serb Army forces exhaust and starve the Bosniak population. "Through organized daily fighting, create an atmosphere of insecurity, an unbearable and helpless situation for the population of Srebrenica and Žepa. If UNPROFOR [the U.N. Protection Force] leaves Srebrenica and Žepa, the command of the DC [Drina Corps][299] will undertake operation 'Jadar' in order to destroy Muslim forces in these enclaves and fully liberate Podrinje."[300]

While only rare international activists and officials have been willing to expose the failings of the United Nations to the world, analysis of their reports indicates that U.N. troops were complicit in imposing famine on the Bosniak population. Numerous U.N. internal documents show that French general Philippe Morillon and officers who served below him downplayed the situation in Srebrenica and Žepa. An evaluation of the situation in Cerska submitted in March 1993 stated that around five thousand refugees fled to Srebrenica after the fall of Cerska, while another eight thousand residents hid in the mountains around the town. The author of the report noted in the most bureaucratic of language that "the population did not appear to be starving, but neither were they well nourished."[301] Not until point 13 of the report did the author mention the testimony of a Reuters journalist, who had said he'd seen the corpses of people who had obviously starved to death in Srebrenica, like those he'd seen in Somalia.[302]

Bosniaks who were living in Srebrenica from June 1992 on were almost all refugees who had been expelled from the Podrinje region, the Drina Valley east of Srebrenica, the northern part of the Bratunac region, Vlasenica, Milići, Han-Pijesak, and the southern part of the Skelani region. With Srebrenica besieged and cut off from the rest of the world, famine was easily imposed when Serb forces blocked delivery of food to the town by taking control of main transport routes. The Serb strategy of induced famine was supported by the passive attitude of U.N. leadership.

Starvation, Shelling, Cleansing

A U.N. report from March 18, 1993, mentioned that Serb Army forces had stopped a convoy of humanitarian relief because its passage had not been announced by Belgrade. It said that the morale of Bosniak soldiers was plummeting, and that Srebrenica was so overpopulated that dozens of civilians could be wounded with only one grenade. It noted that local commanders had reported the village of Osmača had been bombarded from the air again, and when a U.N. Military Observer team visited the villages of Osmača and Gladovići its members confirmed that shelling had increased since their last visit. They calculated that, on average, forty bombs fell on the villages each hour.[303] Reports on the situation in Srebrenica submitted by different U.N. officers vary widely in their interpretation of events. Some on General Morillon's staff did not appear to believe that the suffering of Bosniaks was too alarming and, therefore, failed to request any serious intervention. However, Major J. J. Purves wrote that Serb attacks on the enclave were ongoing, and that Bosnian Serbs were supported by Serbian artillery and aircraft. His report described the ghastly situation, estimating that there were around eighty thousand refugees in Srebrenica, and that three hundred people were hospitalized, of whom two hundred were seriously wounded. Major Purves reported a mortality rate of twenty people per day and said, "If secure passage out of Srebrenica is not provided in the next 7 to 14 days, indications are that Serbs will conduct a genocidal 'cleansing' of the entire enclave, which may result in the deaths of 80,000 human beings. There is little hope that efforts to force Serbs to halt their attacks will be successful. It is unlikely that Serbs will stop their offensive until the enclave is cleared, one way or another."[304]

Ambassador Diego Arria, the Venezuelan representative to the U.N. Security Council at the time of the aggression in Bosnia, testified before The Hague tribunal twice in cases concerning Srebrenica. Among other things, Ambassador Arria voiced concerns about pro-Serb officials within the U.N. system. According to his testimony, some U.N. officials had conspired to cover up the situation in Srebrenica. One example he offered was of a letter sent by U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees Sadako Ogata to U.N. General Secretary Boutros Boutros-Ghali on March 18, 1993. Despite its distressing content, Arria testified that Boutros-Ghali simply placed the letter in his desk drawer, choosing not to bring the information before the Security Council or determine a course of action in response to such alarming statements as: "The situation in the Srebrenica enclave is deteriorating by the hour. The latest reports I've received from my staff on the spot are appalling. Thousands of people are entering the town from surrounding areas which have been systematically attacked and taken by Serb forces. People are dying from military action and starvation and lack of medical treatment at a rate of 30 to 40 a day. Everything would indicate that a massive humanitarian tragedy is unfolding in the Srebrenica enclave. I believe key world leaders should be alerted to these developments."[305]

Arria claimed further that a reverence for Serbs by other European officials could be seen in the field as well. During a Security Council mission to Srebrenica on April 25, 1993, British brigadier Vere Hayes—second in the U.N. chain of command—openly showed respect to Serb forces. According to Arria, "Brigadier Hayes behaved more like a subordinate to the Serb side in Bosnia than as an officer. We were surprised, the mission, to see how . . . disrespectful he was [to] the country that was hosting him."[306] Moreover, Arria told the court that Hayes had worked to create obstacles to prevent the mission from fully understanding and reporting the reality on the ground. Hayes, "following orders from the Serb side," requested that all mission delegates hand over their cameras, "because [the Serbs] didn't want anyone with a camera entering Srebrenica." Arria refused to relinquish his camera and managed to take some of the few photographs of Srebrenica from that time, which he later gave to Reuters for publication. To the court, Arria said: "Why would the United Nations cooperate with Serbs in preventing photographs? Not from the journalists . . . the journalists never got to Srebrenica. [They] prevented the *ambassadors* from taking photographs. That's really amazing and shocking."[307]

The Security Council's mission to Srebrenica was initiated by Ambassador Arria, who found that U.N. officials did everything they could to convince the delegation to give up on the idea of intervening. But the members of the delegation persisted and, when they finally arrived in Srebrenica, were stunned by what they saw. "I remember there were five other ambassadors with me, one was a Russian. And I told him, you know, I was in Leningrad recently and I saw the museum and saw the photographs [of the World War II siege there]. And I said . . . you must be moved by the tragedy that you are watching. I said, you know, what we have here is a slow-motion genocide taking place under the protection of the United Nations security forces. . . . I even said that our officers look more like the kapos in a concentration camp rather than the protectors of the people."[308]

A kapo was a prisoner in a concentration camp during World War II who worked in subordinate administrative positions. The Nazis relied on the cooperation of kapos for the supervision of prisoners and to prevent any kind of rebellion. Arria's comparison of U.N. security forces to kapos reflected their subservient role toward Serb Army forces but was also tinged with the implication that U.N. forces behaved in a way that was humiliating and dishonorable.

The Doctrine of "War to Extermination"

Serb officers were familiar with the idea of a "war to extermination" even before they launched the aggression against Bosnia and Herzegovina. The offensive instigated against the Republic of Croatia by the JNA laid bare the willingness of its commanding officers to utterly violate international conventions and spurn the idea of a just war.[309] A document issued in August 1991 lists the tasks of the Fourth Corps, including: inflicting the greatest loss to the enemy as is possible both in human lives and equipment; the decimation and exhaustion of enemy forces; preventing the enemy from escaping.[310] These instructions reflect the JNA strategy in its attack on Vukovar, Croatia, where civilians were targeted in an unprecedented manner during an eighty-seven-day-long siege of the city, from August to November 1991. Tasks assigned to the JNA's Fourth Corps were in complete opposition to what we consider "civilized" warfare, in which the goal is to disable enemy forces and therefore political actors, but not to fight to the point of annihilation.

War to extermination became a common model for the JNA and other Serb and Bosnian Serb forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Numerous documents discussed in this book illustrate that the extermination of Bosniaks was fully acceptable to Serb military leadership. Many more documents attest to the fact that genocidal behavior and violations of the laws of war were commonplace. In one report from December 28, 1992, a Serb military commander describes the behavior of Muslim civilians on the road to Glogova: "We estimate that there are about 500 soldiers and a much larger number of civilians (about 1,000 women, and children). . . . They arrived in large numbers in the evening, moving freely in columns despite constant fire from our artillery."[311] The hopelessness of the victims he describes—people walking in lines, paying no attention to a hail of Serb shelling around them—is overshadowed only by the callousness of soldiers shelling civilians.

The ceremony marking the founding of the Bratunac Brigade on November 14, 1992, provided more evidence which supports the notion that the doctrine of "war to extermination" was being implemented at all levels among Serb Army forces, and that Serb soldiers were regularly indoctrinated with a genocidal ideology. At the ceremony, General Milenko Živanović told those in attendance, "As the winter is coming, I expect it to be our ally. The results of the fighting have been impressive so far; great results. How great? Well, we are keeping 80,000 Turks encircled. Turks from Cerska cannot meet those from Srebrenica, Turks from Žepa cannot go to Srebrenica. Those from Goražde cannot go to Žepa. These are really impressive results if one looks from a broader perspective. Now we should be persistent, smart, intelligent Serb warriors, and should not fall for any Turkish tricks. Reconnoiter; be in constant contact with them through reconnaissance. Prepare traps for them and wait for them. Do not fall for naïve tricks."[312]

Colonel Svetozar Andrić also used the opportunity to promote genocidal ideas. He added: "There is only Srebrenica left, but I believe, as [Živanovic] has said . . . 'We'll take it, even if we have to demolish it.' "[313] Following these incendiary remarks, Serb officers sang: "From Topola to Ravna Gora, we are General Draža's guards. . . . We shall kill and slaughter everyone who does not join us."[314] General Draža, of course, is a reference to Chetnik commander Mihailović—another of the many long-dead representatives of Serb solidarity who remain very much alive in nationalistic propaganda.

Bosniaks were quite aware that a conflict of this nature, a war to extermination, was likely to be waged against them. This fact was obvious to a number of foreign officials as well. One former British officer, who served in U.N. forces and was stationed in Srebrenica in March 1993, told the ICTY that refugees he saw in Srebrenica had faced a "remorseless" offensive and "believed they were going to die. It was not a question of if, it was only a question of when."[315]

Drawing from Ambassador Arria's testimony, taking into account Serb genocidal intentions and military superiority, and considering the interests of international decision makers, Bosniak victims' resistance served only to make genocide in Srebrenica happen in "slow motion." No matter the pace of the process, the genocidal aims of Serb leadership were maintained from before and throughout the aggression of 1992 to 1995. The genocide finally committed in July of 1995 against Bosniaks was the culmination of a course of action that began in April 1992 and had been planned and envisioned for many years beforehand.

5

THE EIGHTH STAGE OF GENOCIDE—DENIAL

BOSNIAN SERBS AND THE DENIAL OF GENOCIDE

When social circumstances arise under which a majority tolerates or supports genocide against another group, scholars and humanitarians ask: Why does genocide happen? Does genocide underscore the dark side of human nature? If we accept that there is a dark side of human nature, how do we work toward genocide prevention? But these questions usually aren't posed by the group on whose behalf genocide has been committed, nor are they addressed by international diplomacy, international law, or the media. This book maintains that denial is the final stage of genocide; and the stage of denial shares universal characteristics among perpetrators of genocides throughout history. Helmut Dubiel asserts that the collective memory of postwar Germans filtered information in order to validate instilled thinking and emotional matrices. He notes: "Later, it became clear that many obviously irrational views of the time—such as the need of Germans to make victims of themselves, to shift guilt onto Hitler as an individual, or to interpret National Socialism as a natural disaster—had the function of preserving the stereotypes about the world which created the totalitarian system."[1]

The question of guilt was rejected by most Germans as a concept imposed upon them unjustly, and Hitler was blamed for the entirety of the Nazi regime and the atrocities committed during its reign. In Dubiel's view, the narrow collective memory shared by a majority of Germans after the war was so persistent because it was rooted in guilt.[2] He argues that guilt is an elementary existential experience. "The primary part of our identity is made from moral criteria gained through our education: moral criteria guide us, but we may also violate them. The possibility of guilt arises from the possibility of this violation, that is, of the experience of complete divergence of our internal moral criteria and the life we live."[3]

Strictly speaking, the paradox of guilt is that it emerges when we are not ready to accept it, that is, ready to assume responsibility for the violation of our internal moral criteria, by our self or on our behalf. This type of guilt, coined "second guilt" by Ralph Giordano, arises from a lack of readiness to integrate our crimes, or even the consequences of indifference to injustice in our past, into the process of informing our identity. This kind of guilt is a barrier to the collective awareness that can preempt malevolence, and it pervades societies long after a causative event. As former president of Germany Richard von Weizsäcker warned in the famous speech he delivered on May 8, 1985, the fortieth anniversary of the end of the Second World War: "All of us, whether guilty or not, whether old or young, must accept the past. We are all affected by its consequences and liable for it. . . . It is not a case of coming to terms with the past. That is not possible. It cannot be subsequently modified or made undone. However, anyone who closes his eyes to the past is blind to the present. Whoever refuses to remember the inhumanity is prone to new risks of infection."[4]

The concepts of guilt developed by Dubiel, Giordano, and von Weizsäcker correspond to that developed by Karl Jaspers in his book *The Question of Guilt*.[5] Jaspers argues that, besides criminal guilt, there are political, moral, and metaphysical guilt. Jaspers also asserts that moral failures cause crime and, consequently, political guilt.[6] He relates the morality of individuals in society to the political context of a community, and collective guilt to political liability. He points out that while state authorities may be the only ones held responsible, a nation may suffer from collective moral guilt because a political reality arose from that population's way of life.[7] Drinka Gojkovic outlines the dilemma faced by Serbs, for wars fought on their behalf in the 1990s: "If I cannot speak with utter conviction about the guilt of a collective, can I then—with utter conviction, again—speak about its innocence? I live in a country whose prewar and war policies were a direct cause for mass suffering of other nations. I belong to the same nationality as those who planned, gave orders and committed these deeds. I am connected to them by time, space and political context. Their deeds, or rather, misdeeds, were concocted and carried out in my living presence. Can it be that these deeds have nothing whatsoever to do with me? Perhaps it is not my fault that they did what they did, but can I say with a clear conscience that I am innocent? And if I am not innocent, then must I—after all—be guilty?"[8]

Guilt evasion, as noted by Dubiel, is one of the causes of genocide denial. To accept collective moral guilt is the first step toward catharsis for a nation, necessary to prevent the repetition of genocide. Collective denial of genocide, however, encompasses a wide variety of individual defensive mechanisms functioning within members of a group. One of the most common justifications of the refusal to accept responsibility for genocide is that in totalitarian regimes a majority of people are simply following orders given by a supreme authority figure, and are therefore in the "agentic state" illustrated in the experiments of Stanley Milgram and Philip Zimbardo, described in chapter 1.

The denial of genocide by ordinary Bosnian Serbs in eastern Bosnia is discussed in this chapter, which also considers members of the international community who fueled the myth of "equal guilt for equal crimes" committed in Bosnia and Herzegovina through relativistic views expressed in academic and diplomatic circles. This denial by members of the international community not only slowed the wheels of justice but intensified the trauma of genocide victims, effectively ending the reconciliation process before it started.

One of the reasons many people deny genocide is because it exposes the dark side of human nature and forces painful examination of justifying ideologies. Many authors have paid due attention to research that assesses the behavior of ordinary people in genocidal processes, dividing them into three categories: perpetrators, bystanders, and saviors.[9] As for genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the following questions are frequently asked: Who is the average Bosnian Serb that tacitly approved of mass murder? What kind of person is willing to pull the trigger as many times as ordered to? And, perhaps the most salient question of all: What is the difference between Bosnian Serbs who perpetrated genocide and those who risked their own life to protect their neighbors from concentration camps, murder, and rape?

The Story of Saviors

Strategic studies specialist Norman Cigar has noted that coercion was frequently used to compel Bosnian Serbs to commit crimes. Those who refused to align themselves with the genocidal politics of Serb leadership were considered highly dangerous because they posed an unwelcome challenge to this political discourse. During preparations for the war, the Serb leadership first used tactics of persuasion to attempt to bring on board police officers who had refused to join the pursuit of the "Serb cause," but if they refused to join, the well-being of officers and their families was threatened.[10] Yet the fact that Bosniak survivors have very few stories about their Serb neighbors expressing solidarity or sympathy, or offering help to them, illustrates the vast space between active support of an ideology and active opposition to it—while Serbs may have needed to be incentivized by fear to act against Bosniaks, they needed little incentive to turn a blind eye. Early in the war, there are only a few recorded examples of Serbs in eastern Bosnia who risked their own lives, or the lives of their families, to save Bosniak neighbors. Most readily accepted nationalist ideology and the idea that Bosniaks were an obstacle to an ethnically homogenous Serb state, and therefore needed to be removed at any cost. One exception was highlighted in the Rogatica case study in the previous chapter, when people from the village of Rasput Njive saved the lives of their Bosniak neighbors from the village of Mađer.[11] Villagers from Rasput Njive are a shining example of saviors who, risking their own lives, helped their Bosniak neighbors and said later that they would do it again.

There are also some instances in which guards in concentration camps were able to protect their Bosniak friends. Ibro Osmanović, a prisoner in the Sušica camp in Vlasenica, testified in the Dragan Nikolić trial that his longtime friend Ljubinko Đurić, a guard in the camp, had saved his life. When another guard threatened Osmanović, Đurić stepped in: "I will not let you take him. Over there in the hangar you can take any woman you want, but I'm not letting you take him."[12] This is evidence that the process of dehumanizing Muslims was not always complete, even in those who participated willingly in the aggression. Ljubinko Đurić appears comfortable with the moral negotiation that allows a potential murderer to "take any woman from the hangar" but saves Osmanović, a friend to whom he has an emotional connection and feels affection for. Ređo Čakišić from Vlasenica was another witness in the Nikolić trial. He also testified that a Serb, who was in this case a complete stranger to him, prevented another Serb soldier from killing him and several other Muslims. Čakišić had been tasked with burying the dead bodies of Bosniaks killed in the Sušica camp. While Čakišić was completing this horrendous job, a soldier indicated that he wanted to kill him and the other Bosniaks so that there would be no living witnesses. Another Serb soldier stopped him.[13]

These examples show Serb soldiers reacting as human beings, not as agents of a justifying ideology. In the case of Đurić, recognition of Ibro Osmanović as his friend, rather than as a Bosniak enemy, led him to an emotional response. The reaction of the unknown soldier in the case of Ređo Čakišić, however, seems to have greater moral relevance, because the soldier prevented the deaths of Bosniaks to whom he had no emotional attachment, acting instead based on the fundamental moral obligation one human being has to another.

There were Serbs who risked their lives to save their Bosniak neighbors in other regions of Bosnia and Herzegovina as well. As a man from Prijedor related, a Bosnian Serb who was caught helping Bosniaks and Croats was punished by "true" Serbs by detaining him in the same camp as those he had tried to help, and "Serb leadership was brutal to disloyal Serbs."[14] Bosnian

Serbs who disagreed with the genocidal politics of their ethnic representatives' political and military leadership usually left the occupied regions of Bosnia and Herzegovina and went abroad. But the majority of Bosnian Serbs stayed in Bosnia, and many of those who lived in the territories that now constitute the Republika Srpska participated in the genocide in a variety of ways.

The case of father and son Neško and Slobodan Đokić shows that not all help to Bosniaks was met with inevitable retaliation by Serb leaders. In July 1995, a group of four Bosniak men got lost on their way from Srebrenica to Tuzla and found themselves in a Serb village. The senior Đokić gave them food and clothing, and brought his son from the frontline to show them the way to Tuzla. Later, the four Bosniaks were apprehended; before being shot they were forced to reveal who had helped them. Charges of "cooperation with enemy soldiers" were pressed against Neško and Slobodan, but the case was soon dropped.[15] The historic example of German women who were married to Jews similarly proved that it was possible to protest against Nazi genocide without inevitably facing persecution by the state. In 1943, about two thousand German women organized street protests against the incarceration and deportation of their Jewish husbands. The response of the Nazi authorities was to release the women's husbands![16] In these two examples, it was possible for people to play the role of saviors without facing a punitive response. The case of the German women was evidence that the state required some consensus for the perpetration of genocide, and that an en masse rebellion of citizens successfully prevented, or at least mitigated, some crimes.

Ironically, awareness that something could have been done to prevent genocide during World War II may have been the reason for an awakening to collective guilt later, which led to the denial of genocide. After genocide is committed, many people are bound to deny knowledge or understanding of what happened. This chapter considers further the comparison between denial of genocide committed by Nazis in Austria and Germany during World War II and by Bosnian Serbs during the 1992–1995 aggression against Bosnia and Herzegovina.

BYSTANDERS: INDIFFERENCE AS A MECHANISM OF DENIAL

In his explanation of the complex mechanisms of Holocaust denial applied by "ordinary Germans" who were not involved in murder, Walter Laqueur described the paradox of the "denial of knowing": "It is, in fact, quite likely that while many Germans thought that the Jews were no longer alive, they did not necessarily believe that they were dead."[17] Such logical inconsistency accepted in a time of extreme psychological pressure, usually during wartime or in other emergencies, reflects a disintegration of rationality.[18] Serb witnesses from eastern

Bosnia who testified before the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY) exhibited this phenomenon. In her testimony on October 22, 2004, Milenija Mitrović from the hamlet of Kušići in the municipality of Skelani evoked the neighborly solidarity of prewar relationships between Serbs and Bosniaks. She talked about how they helped each other with the harvest, drank coffee together, went to each other's weddings, and never thought that war was an option. She had a positive opinion of Bosniaks and said that "they were all good people."[19] When asked if she knew what happened to her Bosniak neighbors in May 1992, Mitrović quickly responded: "I didn't know, no. I didn't know anything. I didn't meet anyone because I didn't go out anymore."[20]

Stanley Cohen argues there are states of denial—mental and political—in which denial means "not giving the information much thought."[21] Such a mental state was the most common form of denial in Germany during the Second World War. The ease with which many ordinary German citizens reached this state of denial may be explained by the fact that they regarded the victims as Jews, not Germans, and by an eagerness to fall in line with the governmental authority.[22] Research suggests a widespread indifference of Germans during World War II to the killing of Jews, that is, an indifference to any events that did not directly affect their personal life.[23]

The behavior of a majority of Bosnian Serbs during the genocide against Bosniaks made clear that this indifference was not exclusive to World War II–era Germans. Witness Novka Božić from Radiljevići, a village just three kilometers from Fakovići, testified before the ICTY on October 27, 2004. Her testimony indicates that she had also accepted indifference as a mechanism of denial.[24] Božić, like Milenija Mitrović, had nothing but words of praise for her Bosniak neighbors. Many Bosniaks were her friends. However, Božić claimed she did not know why so many Bosniaks left their homes in May 1992. She knew they had gone, but she could not tell the tribunal why. When asked why she had never tried to find out what might have happened to her Bosniak neighbors, she replied: "We were busy with our affairs. I wasn't really interested in what was going on, how all of this came about."[25]

Defense lawyer John Jones pressed Božić, wondering why she had not been interested in what had happened to her friends, and she stammered, "They were—they had their reasons. I don't know." In fact, Bosniaks from the village of Žanjevo had been expelled from their homes and were living in nearby hills.[26] Faced with the "denial of knowing" displayed by Božić, Jones persisted: "Well, let's explore those reasons. Why would people leave their homes that they've lived in all their lives, and their fields which are their only source of livelihood, why would they leave those homes all of a sudden?" Božić answered: "I don't know. I don't know why they left. They left. Our people left as well. That's how it was. I don't know the why and how of it. It's something that I cannot explain or tell you. I don't know." When asked if perhaps Bosniaks were forced to leave their homes at gunpoint, Božić replied with some exasperation, "I don't know. I don't know who would do that . . . why they left, I don't know. From what I was able to see, there were no threats. . . . I don't know how they left, why they left."[27]

Novka Božić's denial is hardly viable. Unsatisfied by her responses, the lawyer asked her if it was correct that she had seen her Bosniak neighbors hiding "up in the woods above [the] hills at night." Her denial began to unravel: "What do I know? At night, when night falls, those of us who were there, we worked during the day. At night you just go to bed and you go to sleep. I really didn't look around that much. And even if I did, what would one see in the forest, in the woods? I don't know."[28] When pressed further about having seen groups of Muslims from Žanjevo in the woods after May 1992, Božić wavered: "I don't know what I saw. We would see them, but I can't say that there was any talk. I can't say that there was any hatred or that we did anything to one another. I really don't know anything about that."

The exchange between Jones and Božić that followed further supports the absurd constructs of her ignorance and illustrates that the paradox of denial is that one must know in order to deny, but in denial one must say one never knew. Jones asked Božić, as an exercise of logic, "You've said how there's rich farmland down by the Drina. In your opinion, knowing this area, is it better to live on your farms with your livestock and crops, or is it better to be in the woods and hills above your village? What is the better place to live?" Božić replied that it was of course better to live on one's own property and to cultivate one's land. Jones then asked Božić (twice) if she had heard of the expression "ethnic cleansing." She offered a simple, "No."[29]

Novka Božić went one step further into denial than Milenija Mitrović when she chose to "look the other way." Cohen asserts that this phrase implies access to reality but also the choice to ignore it because it is more convenient to do so. "This might be a simple fraud: the information is available and registered, but leads to a conclusion which is knowingly evaded."[30]

For the most part, Božić's testimony aligns with the theory of indifference, although her claim that she had never heard the expression "ethnic cleansing" is so unbelievable that it is more likely a conscious lie used by the witness to bring an end to unpleasant questions posed by the defense lawyer. The example of Novka Božić and the paradox of denial she represents is reflected in the argument by Jean-Paul Sartre that "the one to whom the lie is told and the one who lies are one and the same person, which means that I must know in my capacity of deceiver the truth which is hidden from me in my capacity as the one deceived. Better yet I must know the truth very exactly *in order* to conceal it more carefully."[31]

The choice Cohen refers to was similarly made by Slavka Matić, a Bosnian Serb from the village of Bjelovac in the municipality of Bratunac. She also testified before the ICTY and was asked if she was aware of what had happened to 240 Bosniaks from nearby Sikirići village, many of whom were killed in the infamous Vuk Karadžić school in Bratunac or in the Sase camp. Matić answered: "I know nothing about that. I didn't wish to see it, and I don't know about it."[32]

After World War II, Austrians weren't any more willing than Matić or Božić to admit how much they knew about the genocide that had been perpetrated against Jews. Forty years later, historian Gordon Horowitz interviewed peasants who had lived next to the Mauthausen concentration camp, in an attempt to discover how much Austrians really *had* known about what happened there. What he found was that they'd had enough information but had refused to connect the dots in order to avoid having to face the reality. And when that reality came knocking, people did all they could to distance themselves from it. One Austrian woman wrote an official complaint to the authorities about an "incident" that took place near her house. A prisoner was killed and another wounded and left in her line of sight for more than half a day. In her complaint she wrote: "I request that such inhumane actions be stopped, or performed where nobody can see them."[33]

The indifference mechanism functioned in the same way both for Germans and Austrians in the 1940s and for Bosnian Serb women in the 1990s. The difference between "I didn't know" and "I didn't *want* to know" is seemingly minor and, practically, reflects the same degree of "alienation from human life"[34] whether the victims are Jewish or Bosniak. But the "I didn't want to know" offered to the court by Slavka Matić is more sincere than "I *didn't* know," because by giving such an answer, she admitted she had some awareness of the atrocious acts committed against her Bosniak neighbors. Matić's choice offered her an internal, private asylum built from ignorance. Her "I didn't want to know" is a subtext for her true meaning: "I knew, but I *chose* not to not know so that I didn't have to respond."

Perpetrators: Denial of an Active Military Role in Genocide

Many Bosnian Serb witnesses who testified before the ICTY denied their active military role in the aggression against Bosnia and Herzegovina. This denial may have twofold significance: a manifestation, albeit delayed, of shame for their actions or an attempt to evade responsibility for war crimes by denying formal association with Serb Army forces, via such claims as "I only worked as a cook." The testimony of Nikola "Cojka" Popović at the trial of Naser Orić belongs in the latter category. Numerous other witnesses had pointed to Popović as an active Republika Srpska Army (VRS) soldier who had served since the beginning of the aggression, and in July 1995 he committed a number of crimes during the occupation of Srebrenica and the perpetration of genocide there.[35] During his testimony, Popović was presented with valid documentation of his role in these crimes, including certification from the Bratunac military post of his active role as a soldier throughout the entire war. But according to Popović, there was never any formal mobilization or an organized armed force, only a self-organized village guard made up of his Serb neighbors. Popović further denied that he had participated in massacres, but toward the end of his testimony did confirm that he had been a member of the military police within the Bratunac Brigade. Members of this unit are known to have participated in the transportation, incarceration, and killing of Bosniak prisoners. The head of the Bratunac Brigade Security Unit, Momir Nikolić, pleaded guilty in 2003 to crimes committed by his unit in July 1995, and he was sentenced to twenty-three years' imprisonment.[36] In his plea agreement, Nikolić specifically mentioned Popović and his role in the massacre.[37]

Comparative studies conducted by Stanley Cohen, who analyzed different denial mechanisms, indicate a similarity between ordinary offenders, who often claim mistaken identity, and ideological perpetrators. According to Cohen, accounts by alleged perpetrators make them sound like ordinary delinquents. A commonly used excuse is: "I wasn't even there at the time." Another used by "ordinary offenders" is the claim of mistaken identity.[38] Both excuses were heard in the ICTY testimony of Serb soldiers from eastern Bosnia.

During his testimony, Dragan Đurić tried to convince the court that he was not aware of what had happened in Bratunac during the war.[39] He denied being a VRS soldier during the aggression, and when confronted with a list of soldiers' salaries that included his name on it, he feigned ignorance. Đurić's denial provoked an uncommonly intolerant response from Judge Carmel Agius: "People don't receive money for nothing, Mr. Đurić. If you received 9,300 dinars, what did you receive them for? For being at home and staying at home?"[40] After grueling questioning, and presentation of a list of Srebrenica genocide perpetrators that included his name, Đurić finally admitted he had been in the Bratunac Brigade but continued to claim he knew nothing about the command structure of the VRS.

Đurić also tried to use mistaken identity as a defense. When presented with yet another list on which his name appeared, of draftees into the Ježestica 1 Company, he reasoned: "There are a few men named Dragan Đurić in Ježestica and surrounding villages. Actually, there are two in Ježestica at the moment. Others moved out."[41] It was only after seeing a second document containing not just his name but also the date he was born and the name of his father that he admitted to being the same Dragan Đurić. But he continued to claim he was not sure his company had been Ježestica 1.

Another interesting case of military service denial is that of Slavoljub Filipović, a VRS soldier who denied having a uniform during the war. Even after a video was played in the courtroom that showed Filipović giving an interview in a uniform, he persisted in his denial, saying he had been given a uniform just before the interview.[42] A thorough analysis of the testimonies of the many Bosnian Serbs who denied VRS membership to the court suggests that these men were aware that their membership in the VRS between 1992 and 1995 implied their involvement in crimes. One of the best illustrations of this is the case of Nikola Petrović, who testified before the ICTY on April 15, 2005. Petrović was also presented with a list of draftees that included his name. He denied his service in the same manner as other former VRS soldiers. However, testifying in court often challenges the ability of people to deny guilt, probably due to the authority of the judges and the anxiety of being questioned under oath. When asked if he knew about expelled Bosniaks and the many people who were tortured in the Sase camp, Petrović admitted that "there were stories and rumours that Bosniaks had been expelled," but he added, "but I don't know about the camp in Sase."[43] Then, Petrović was presented with evidence that on May 13, 1992, he himself was in a unit that attacked the Bosniak villages of Voljevica and Zaluzje. When he was told that people had seen him in the operation, in which dozens of civilians were killed and houses were burned down, he was evasive, responding to the claims of witnesses and not to the question of whether he had been involved: "As far as I know nobody ever mentioned my name or saw me there."[44]

Pseudostupidity as a Mechanism of Denial

As Cohen discussed in his book *States of Denial*, ordinary offenders often employ a pseudostupidity that allows them to claim ignorance of events, even when those claims are not viable. Nikola Popović did just this when he was asked if he knew what had happened to people from the village of Glogova in May 1992. He first said that Glogova had been "cleansed at the beginning of the war." When he was asked to explain what he meant by the expression "cleansed," Popović said: "I don't know what happened there. Glogova was not part of Kravica. It's closer to Bratunac. I know nothing about that, about what happened at the time." Reminded by the defense that he had used the word "cleansed" himself, and asked to clarify exactly what he meant, Popović explained that "there were no Muslims. . . . [I]t was cleansed, so that the Muslims had left Glogova."[45] When asked if he heard that thousands of Muslims had been killed in Hranča, Glogova, Suha, Borkovac, Voljevica, Magašići, and Mihajlovići, Popović claimed he had "never heard such thing."[46]

This type of denial aligns Popović with those considered to be "arrogant" deniers. He openly denies facts that he, as a VRS soldier, was bound to know. In his typology of denial, Cohen strictly differentiates between ideological and ordinary perpetrators. He asserts that ordinary perpetrators deny their actions only to evade criminal responsibility, while "we should not expect to hear this from ideological perpetrators: they knew exactly what was happening and what they did, it was justified at the time, and in retrospect still is."[47] In reality, this is too sharp a division. Many ordinary perpetrators—like Popović—are influenced by genocidal ideology, justify their actions within that framework, and as a result do not feel guilt for their crimes. Nikola Popović may be an ordinary perpetrator but, if so, he is a very ideologized ordinary perpetrator, whose testimony before the ICTY revealed no guilty conscience and reflected the belief that genocide committed against Bosniaks was justified. Ordinary perpetrators are just as dangerous as the ideologists and those who issue orders themselves. Their danger lies in their numbers, and in the fact that it is more difficult to locate them and try them in court because they can quietly hide behind even greater numbers of passive bystanders. In the event of a repeat crisis, besides the ideologists and planners it is the ideologized perpetrators who pose a major threat of repeat genocide because they represent a group of enthusiastic genocide perpetrators who have managed to justify their own brutal behavior.

Violence as a Family Tradition

Facing the aftermath of genocide, and led by the notion of individual criminal responsibility, societies that have been damaged by such violence tend to exonerate the group on whose behalf genocide was committed from collective moral, political, and metaphysical guilt, as described by Karl Jaspers. While this is ostensibly a humane and intellectually generous approach, it can cause difficulties in finding the answer to why genocide was possible or can lead a society away from the search for a successful genocide prevention model. As individual identity and perceptions of the world are shaped in a sociocultural context, it follows that many authors argue that a national culture which is historically violent—in other words, a "culture of violence"—tends more toward genocide than a historically nonviolent culture.[48]

A culture of violence comprises three common patterns that enable the perpetration of genocide. They are: "the use of aggression as a normative problem-solving skill; a conflict orientation grounded in an assumption of antipathy [to 'others'] with a perceived threat orientation; and an ideology of supremacy grounded in a history of dehumanization including the long-term institutionalization of bias and lack of acceptance for cultural diversity."[49] Each of these patterns can exist on the broader, national level or at more localized, community levels. Many relevant studies have been undertaken on the culture of violence that is fostered within Serb families through the Kosovo myth. Both the Kosovo myth and Njegoš's "Mountain Wreath" (discussed in chapter 2), which glorifies violence against Muslims, have contributed significantly to a Serbian Orthodox culture of violence.[50] As Milorad Ekmečić notes, "The Mountain Wreath" "was published in twenty editions between 1847 and 1913," becoming the most widely read book among Serbs. It was from "The Mountain Wreath" and the Kosovo myth that the Serbian nationalist movement took its ethics in the century that followed.[51]

In Anzulović's analysis of personal conflict, he cites the work of Milovan Đilas (1911–1995)—a prominent Communist leader and eventual dissident—in which Đilas told of how complicated it was for Montenegrins to break away from the family cult of violence.[52] Đilas said that peasants in his village knew "The Mountain Wreath" by heart and that, for them, it might as well have served as the Bible. "They experienced 'The Mountain Wreath' as simultaneously loftier and simpler than other literature. It uncovered for them something untransitory, something that would last as long as their race and tongue survived. It was expressed in the language of every day, woven together powerfully and completely, as though it were not created at all, but existed simply of itself, like a mountain or the clear untamed gusts of wind and the sun that played on it. These people hardly knew the Bible. For them 'The Mountain Wreath' might have served as such a book."[53]

In *Land Without Justice*, Đilas also describes the Šahovići massacre of 350 Muslim men, women, children, and elderly people, and hideous crimes including the mutilation of dead bodies by bloodthirsty Montenegrin peasants.[54] He writes that, as the result of that massacre, the Muslim villages in that region "slowly withered," and after selling their lands "for a trifle," their inhabitants began migrating toward Turkey. They were soon replaced by Montenegrin settlers, forever changing the demography of the region.

Đilas even depicts the role of his own father in the Šahovici massacre, and shocked many readers with the degree of personal and intellectual honesty in his story. His book and his disappointment in Communism testify to his attempt to break with the cult of violence in his family and tribal tradition. About the massacre Đilas writes: “The affair produced general horror, even among most of those who had carried it out. My older brother and I were shocked and horrified. We blamed Father for being one of the leaders of the mob. He himself later used to say that he had always imagined the raid was intended only to kill a few Muslim chiefs. Expressing abhorrence at the crimes, Father nevertheless saw in it all something that my brother and I neither would nor could see—an inevitable war of annihilation, begun long ago, between two faiths. Both were fated to swim in blood, and only the stronger would remain on top.”[55]

Land Without Justice is an important book not only because it documents crimes committed by Orthodox Montenegrins and Serbs against their Muslim neighbors but also because it offers an interesting insight into the personal drama Đilas experienced in acknowledging that his father, along with most of his fellow villagers, were war criminals who were capable of killing women and children simply because they were of a different faith. Đilas’s cosmopolitan worldview and intellectual honesty had an expiration date, though. In the post-Communist period, Đilas published a tribute to Njegoš’s poetically presented violent rhetoric, and to the poet for whom the cutting off of heads was a sacred and heroic act. Đilas’s new book was dedicated to the cult of violence, which Đilas had recognized as evil in *Land Without Justice* yet later justified as permissible in the service of Serbia’s national goals. Apparently, Đilas had given up the fight to distance himself from a criminal family tradition; instead, it became much easier to romanticize the violence. His futile attempt illustrates the complexity of psychological denial mechanisms that are used within families to present criminal tradition as heroism.

Eastern Bosnia is rife with historical evidence that genocide is a process repeated throughout history. The romanticizing of the cult of family and tribal violence seen in Đilas’s later work was used by Serb families in eastern Bosnia after World War II to acquit Serbs of any moral responsibility for genocide committed against Bosniaks. For some Serb families in the region the crime has been integrated with family tradition to such a degree that it is misrepresented as a Serb history of courage.

One such family is the Erić family from the village of Kravica. They have a long tradition of participation in rebellions and membership in the Chetnik movement. Vaso Erić was born in 1844. After teaching himself to read and write the Cyrillic alphabet, he became the leader of Serbs from the village of Kravica. He led Serbs from Kravica from one rebellion into another against Bosnia’s feudal landlords in 1875. After the annexation of Bosnia to Austria-Hungary he fled to Serbia. He was a member of the Narodna odbrana (National Defense), a Serbian organization whose goal was to wrest Bosnia from Austro-Hungarian control. He was also a confidant of the prominent Chetnik Major Kosta Todorović. All three of Vaso Erić's sons were active members of Narodna odbrana. This secret organization, while preparing the population for rebellion, also perpetuated cultural nationalism in Srebrenica and Kravica by staging scenes from the Battle of Kosovo. After the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand, the Serbian rebellion against the Austro-Hungarian Army escalated. And not only against the army. Serbs systematically burned Muslim villages and killed Muslim civilians. The Serbian rebellion in Kravica and Srebrenica was swiftly put down. Hundreds of Serbs were summarily shot, and all three of Vaso Erić's sons perished in Austro-Hungarian prison. Vaso himself went into hiding and was condemned to death in absentia. He died in 1932, seven years before the start of World War II.

The World War II history of eastern Bosnia, including Srebrenica and Kravica, is marked by massive casualties among both Muslims and Serbs. Ustasha forces surrounded the village of Kravica, but the inhabitants were saved from mass execution after the intervention of their Muslim neighbors. However, members of the Erić family participated in the genocide of Muslim civilians during World War II. In December 1941, Nego and Golub Erić, Vaso's grandsons, took part in a massacre of eighty-six Muslim civilians in the village of Sopotnik, near Kravica. They were initially sentenced to death, but the sentence was modified to life in prison.[56] Both were at large in Kravica when the recent aggression against Bosnia and Herzegovina was launched and had the opportunity to participate in genocide once again.

The brutality of Serbs from Kravica specifically, and their hatred for Bosniaks—whom they identify with Turks—has been sustained from generation to generation. "I am proud of Golub and Nego," said Mihailo Erić—Golub's grandson—in an interview given to journalist Chuck Sudetic. Despite pride in his family and respect for his grandfather, Mihailo was one of the rare eastern Bosnian Serbs who refused to take up arms and participate in genocide against Bosniaks in July 1995.[57] He was in his apartment in Bratunac when Serbs from Kravica came for him, expecting him to participate in the mass killing of Bosniak prisoners. Mihailo was repulsed by such acts and refused to join them.[58] On the other hand, his father, Zoran, readily accepted. In an interview with Sudetic, Zoran showed no remorse. "Was it honorable to kill them all?" asked Sudetic. "Absolutely," Zoran replied.[59]

The family psychology of denial and justification is well illustrated by the position of Mihailo Erić—who condemned his father Zoran for his role in the July 1995 genocide against Bosniaks but was proud of his grandfather Golub and great-uncle Nego despite the fact that they participated in the massacre of Muslim civilians during World War II.[60] That their actions are a known part of the family folklore was made clear in ICTY testimony given by Slavisa Erić, another of Golub's grandsons, who stated on the record that he was well aware that his grandfather and great-uncle had been involved in the Sopotnik massacre. The Erić and Đilas families are examples of how romanticized violence, fostered by certain elements of Serb national culture, is manifested in reality.

Recommendations for the prevention of genocide increasingly refer to aggressive national cultures as one of its main causes. In chapter 2, I analyzed how Serb national culture, ideology, and nationalistic plans were connected to genocide against Bosniaks. Dehumanization of the "others"—in this case of Muslims—is a salient part of the preparation and perpetration of genocide. The ideology of antagonism[61] that develops between different groups is always a precursor to genocide and other atrocities. This type of ideology has developed toward Tutsis, Armenians, Jews, Bosniaks, and many others throughout history. Not all instances of the development of an ideology of antagonism have resulted in genocide, but no genocide has been initiated without such an ideology. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, "a precursor to the violence . . . has been the history taught to Serb children about the battle of Kosovo in the fourteenth century that led to Turkish domination over Serbs. The way this history has been taught generated continuing hostility toward Muslims and created strong nationalist feelings."[62]

Hence, the ideology of antagonism has not only been fostered in families but been spread through the educational system and other cultural institutions. This ideology requires the denial of earlier crimes, in this case genocide against Bosniaks, and their inclusion as part of a heroic military past. In "The Mountain Wreath" and in Serbian epics in general, Muslims are routinely represented as dangerous enemies (Njegoš depicted the Serbian nation as having been "snuffed out" by Islam),[63] and are so dehumanized that their "extermination" is considered an honorable act when seen through this lens. The transformation of malevolence into the pursuit of a "higher aim" is a process through which rationalizations such as that eventually offered by Đilas are developed: violence is evil but acceptable if Serbianism is the goal. This thinking represents a specific type of denial by which evil is portrayed as beneficial, and the process by which this thinking is cultivated takes place at national, community, and family levels. As Cohen writes, "Denials draw on shared cultural vocabularies to be credible. They may also be shared in another powerful sense: the commitment between people—whether partners or an entire organization—to back up and collude in each other's denials. Without conscious negotiation, family members know what trouble spots to avoid, which facts are better not noticed.

These collusions—mutually reinforcing denials that allow no meta-comment—work best when we are unaware of them. The resulting 'vital lie' in the family may become a literal blind spot."[64]

Only by such mutual denial is the essential evil exhibited by the Đilas and Erić families, and many more, characterized as acceptable violence. But some facts are too brutal to be ignored, and these facts have to be reinterpreted by a family through techniques like minimization, euphemism, and jest.[65] Thus, a family's "vital lie" remains in the dark, sheltered by the silence of collusion, as family members make an unspoken agreement to pass along these brutal facts in a more acceptable form. Members of the Erić family again illustrate the point. To Mihailo, his relatives who fought in World War II are Chetnik heroes; it seems that the Erić family reinterpreted the killings they participated in as heroic and necessary. Yet Mihailo despises and condemns his father's participation in genocide against Muslims in July 1995. The difference is that Mihailo was a witness to the mass killings committed during the more recent genocide, whereas he learned about the crimes of his grandfather and great-uncle through romanticized interpretations. These romanticized stories of genocide are somehow acceptable to him, even when the reality of genocide is not.

Chuck Sudetic's book *Blood and Vengeance* includes conversations Sudetic had with Mihailo Erić that lead one to conclude that Erić was aware both of the causes of war and of the commission of crimes against Bosniaks as early as in 1992. But Mihailo was reticent about this topic, only briefly confirming Sudetic's statements about murders of Bosniak civilians committed in the Vuk Karadžić school in May 1992. What he was willing to openly discuss was the July 1995 genocide against Bosniaks, which he presented as the inappropriate and gruesome revenge of Serbs for an attack on Kravica that took place in January 1993. To recognize the continuity of genocide against Bosniaks, to speak openly about World War II and about the aggression and genocide launched in 1992, amounts to a loss of integrity in his family tradition and, more important, to a loss of cultural identity that forms a basis for his personal identity. To preserve that identity, it seems Mihailo Erić is willing only to identify his father as a criminal, while the memory of his grandfather has been purified by the "vital lie."

EMOTIONAL EGO DEVELOPMENT

Despite numerous studies on the matter, very few psychological theories can adequately explain why ordinary people in extraordinary circumstances perpetrate, tolerate, or justify genocide. Or why people of the same nationality as its perpetrators, who are exposed to the same propaganda, refuse to participate in genocide and even decide to save potential victims. One of the most comprehensive psychological theories attempting to answer why so few individuals play the role of rescuer in the genocidal process was developed by Jane Loevinger and is based on the stages of "emotional ego development."[66] According to Loevinger, an individual progresses through a series of nine stages of development: infancy, impulsivity, self-protectiveness, conformity, self-awareness, conscientiousness, individuality, autonomous functioning, and an integrated stage. Moving from one stage to another brings increased awareness and greater autonomy in decision making, while every successive stage represents a more complex manner in which an individual understands the world.[67] Degrees of ego development may explain why ordinary people respond differently to mass crimes: some becoming executors, many acting as passive bystanders, and a third group—the smallest one—choosing to be saviors. Based on Loevinger's nine stages, Steven Baum suggests using a three-tier system of emotional development for the purpose of simpler analysis—the first marked by immaturity, the second by cultural compliance, and the third by autonomous functioning.[68]

Tier I (low emotional development) is defined by narcissistic indulgence, manifested as behavior that is self-absorbed, impulsive, naive, and opportunistic; it is characterized by a concern for survival and authority, as well as the use of base emotions such as anger, insensitivity, and numbness as defenses, and "black and white" thinking, which results in rigidity and cognitive simplicity.

Tier II (moderate emotional development) is characterized by cultural conformity, attempts to integrate the needs of others and exhibit empathy, enhanced ego strength, and more sophisticated defenses, such as rationalization.

Tier III (highest emotional development) is characterized by emotional authenticity and autonomy, diminished cultural identity, insightfulness, empathy, tolerance, integration of opposites, applied universal justice and spirituality, creativity, integration of emotions with cognitions, and a willingness to face reality.[69]

These schemes put forth by Loevinger and Baum can be used to classify persons who deny or recognize genocide through an analysis of the intersection of their developmental stage with their response to or participation in genocide.

The First Tier of Emotional Development

Baum uses the example of a suicide bomber who is indoctrinated by extremist ideology as a tier I personality, hallmarked by cognitive simplicity, extremism, and an exclusive social identification. Ideologies and cultures that are exclusive rather than inclusive can reasonably be seen as a precursor to genocide and other mass crimes. Combined with the characteristics of low emotional development, including a reverence for authority, this exclusivity may become a fully integrated reality for perpetrators. An average Serb soldier who willingly participated in genocidal actions against Bosniaks between 1992 and 1995 embodies this dynamic. The extremist religious ideology of the Kosovo myth and Njegoš's poetry, which has trained Serbs for centuries to react violently against Bosniaks and everything Islamic, prepared emotionally underdeveloped Serb individuals to carry out genocide.

A textbook example of a tier I personality is Dragomir Miladinović, who testified before the ICTY on December 13, 2004. While describing an attack on the village of Ježestica (in the municipality of Bratunac) in August 1992, he said that the village had been attacked by "not less than a thousand" Muslims, whom he called "Turks."[70] According to his testimony, the attackers were divided into three groups. Those in the first group "were killing people . . . and beating people up," those in the second group were entering houses and "taking things out that they needed" before torching the homes, and those in the third group were "carrying things away." During cross-examination, the witness was asked if the people who attacked and pillaged his village, whom he had described as wearing civilian clothing, immediately ate the food they took away. Miladinović had earlier told the court that the attackers took "better care of the bread than the Serbs did. Because they appreciated the bread." He confirmed that they had indeed eaten this bread immediately; he was asked if perhaps the civilian attackers entered Ježestica that day because they were "desperately hungry." But Miladinović appeared disinterested in the cause: "How on earth should I know?" He was apparently unconcerned by the fact that the people who attacked his village were starving due to the Serbs having encircled them in Srebrenica and having denied U.N. food deliveries to the enclave. Throughout his testimony, Miladinović referred to Bosnian Muslims as "Turks" and spoke of them in a way that revealed he had dehumanized his Bosniak neighbors to such a degree that he did not feel they deserved any food at all. And even after a warning from the judge he did not stop his use of the insulting pejorative "Turks."[71] When Miladinović had finished his testimony, Judge Agius told him: "When I hear you . . . refer to the Muslims as 'Turks,' I don't think you really believe in promoting reconciliation. . . . I know it's not easy to disengage from the past, but . . . you are a *slave* of the past."[72]

The case of Dragomir Miladinović, an elderly and uneducated man indoctrinated over years to an exclusive cultural perspective, is relatively clear cut, but such clarity is somewhat exceptional. The dividing line between persons of different tiers of emotional development and their response to genocide is not always adequate for easy analysis, particularly in borderline cases, because human reactions to crisis include so many variables. Examples such as that of

Miladinović, in which animosity for "others"—in this case for Bosniaks—is transparent, leave no question as to whether a person may take on the role of a rescuer. The question is only whether they will be active participants or will simply offer tacit support for genocide by turning the other way. Both Slaviša Erić and Nikola Popović fit the same model. The importance of the Kosovo myth in the development of this lack of empathy cannot be emphasized enough. For people with tier I emotional development, aggressive national culture plays a key role in reinforcing impulsive, suspicious, and self-protective behavior. Perpetrators of genocide often fall into this category of emotional development, because their lack of empathy and tolerance, combined with weak ego definition, make them highly susceptible to genocidal propaganda. Certainly, this does not mean that all people with tier I personalities will become killers in the midst of genocide, but their lower level of emotional development means they are more vulnerable to the mechanisms which work to create perpetrators of genocide.

The Second Tier of Emotional Development

People in tier II of their emotional development are hallmarked by conformity to social norms. The stereotypical example, according to Baum, would be of an "ordinary, average," middle-class person—the proverbial "law-abiding, church-going citizen." In a genocide, tier II personalities are most likely to constitute the bulk of passive bystanders, though they are also potential perpetrators or saviors, depending on other variables. As in tier I personalities, people who fall into tier II exhibit either underdeveloped or overly rigid social identities. They reflect back whatever they perceive their culture stands for, particularly in politics, religion, and issues of morality. The female Serb witnesses referred to earlier in this chapter—Slavka Matić, Milenija Mitrović, and Novka Božić—are good examples of tier II personalities. Unlike Miladinović, Erić, and Popović, they did not overtly display nationalist rhetoric. On the contrary, theirs was a rhetoric of tolerance toward Bosniaks. Their exclusive Serb identity, however, was so strong that it enabled them to look away as their Bosniak neighbors were killed and expelled. By doing so, they acted in compliance with official Serb political and cultural aims, and conformed to the new social norm of genocide.

Somewhere Between the Second and Third Tiers

It is not so easy to analyze Miloš Okanović through the lens of three tiers of emotional development. An amateur radio operator, Okanović spent the war in the Serbian village of Grabovica, across the Drina River from the Bosnian village of Bjelovac. Some parts of his ICTY testimony were very insightful. Explaining why men in his village were armed and what they were protecting themselves from, he said: "We knew there was very little food to go around, and it was unlikely that someone would come and try to kill us just because they hated us. It would more likely have been for the food."[73] Okanović's answer is balanced and realistic, and contrary to official Serbian discourse about Bosniaks. But Okanović was not willing to extend this parity at all times. Although he confirmed having knowledge that Bosniaks had been starving in the Srebrenica enclave, he denied being aware that Serbs from Bratunac had blocked convoys of humanitarian aid in 1992 and 1993 and had caused the famine Bosniaks faced, saying: "I'm not familiar with this case."[74]

Okanović holds a university degree and revealed in the remainder of his testimony that he was well informed and familiar with media coverage both during and after the war. It was common knowledge that Serbs had held the Bosniaks in Srebrenica under siege and that they had done so by not letting UNHCR humanitarian aid convoys through their lines. It is not possible that someone like Okanović was unfamiliar with these facts—someone who displayed an inclusive and cosmopolitan orientation in his recognition that any threat to his person was due not to hate but starvation. That Okanović is a person who does not tend to see others as a threat makes him a tier III personality, and such people would be expected to act as saviors of the "others," if need be. However, his refusal to recognize the responsibility of Serbs from Bratunac for the starvation of Bosniaks aligns with tier II emotional development, in which people are more willing to look away from an immoral act that threatens their ability to maintain a safe sense of conformity.

Loevinger and Baum's schemes offer a valuable, rough framework for further research into the question of why so many people actively participate in genocide and why an even higher number are passive bystanders. Answering this question may contribute to the effective prevention of genocide. The example of Miloš Okanović, however, indicates that theoretical typologies cannot be strictly applied in real life because of the complexity of human nature, especially when humans are faced with the extremes and confusion of a genocidal process.

The Third Tier of Emotional Development

One of the best examples of tier III emotional development was seen in the Serb villagers of Rasput Njive, who saved their Bosniak neighbors in the summer of 1992. They demonstrated the tier III characteristics of emotional authenticity, diminished cultural identity, empathy, tolerance, integration of opposites, applied universal justice, and reality-based thinking.[75] The Rasput Njive villagers saw nothing unusual in protecting their neighbors and said they would do so again.[76] This altruistic, or humanistic, worldview remained unwaivering even when the role of rescuer came with the ultimate price, such as that paid by Dr. Zoran Gavrić, from Rogatica, who lost his life when he went searching for his friend Ćamil Poljo.[77] Other Serbs throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina also helped their Bosniak neighbors. Often, these saviors faced the same fate as Bosniak victims. Like Dr. Gavrić, a young Serb named Srđan Aleksić was killed by Serb Army forces in 1993 in Trebinje as he tried to defend his friend Alen Glavović.[78]

Social Dominance Orientation

Understanding relations among individuals, groups, and nations in the implementation of genocide is critical for the development of efficient programs for its prevention. The racism and exclusivity that exists in pluralist societies—for example, in the United States—supports the conclusion that pluralism alone does not decrease the likelihood of aggression against the "other." Researchers show that violence is related to social dominance orientation (SDO). Individuals with a high SDO are more prone to endorse racism and are more supportive of sexism, nationalism, and cultural elitism.[79] In addition, researchers have found that artificially inflated self-esteem and egoism, a consequence of adopting an ideology of supremacy, is highly predictive of aggressive behavior in the event that such an inflated ego is threatened.[80]

In isolationist societies, interaction with other groups may be limited, thereby decreasing the chance of conflict even if, culturally, there exists an exclusive worldview. In pluralist societies, often built upon more cosmopolitan aims, tolerance is still not an automatic. If, within pluralism, segregation of ethnic or other groups results in a lack of integration, a fertile ground for development of individuals with a high SDO is created. And when a high national SDO corresponds to a high individual SDO, a political program of extermination of the "other," that is of genocide, may find an opening. Hence, it takes a correlation between the individual and collective SDO to see mass violence implemented.

Many theoreticians have searched for the causes of genocidal and other forms of mass violence, and have found a clear link between prejudice and violence. One of the earliest examples of this is seen in the scapegoat theory, which posits that when a dominant group is frustrated, such as during some kind of crisis, its members tend to lash out at groups that have been socially marginalized. Very interesting and pertinent research into the link between prejudice and violence was conducted in the American South at the height of the use of so-called Jim Crow laws, which authorized de jure racial segregation in all public places. The research, published in 1940, showed an inverse relationship between nineteenth- and early twentieth-century lynchings of African Americans and the price of cotton. When cotton prices were high, lynchings were down, and vice versa.[81] The crisis experienced by the dominant group (whites) in that case was the financial anxieties linked to lower market prices for their primary commodity, cotton, and their aggressive displays in reaction to this crisis were leveled against the marginalized black population.

The scapegoat theory has been heavily criticized, however. Contemporary researchers have found that frustrated individuals will not lash out at just any group against which they are biased, but that only certain groups are targeted for genocide. Wolf and Hulsizer ask why Latinos and Jews were not lynched in the United States as African Americans were. Or why the Twa minority was not targeted for genocide in Rwanda.[82] Still, scapegoat theory research is very useful, because it points to the cause of individual SDO variation and the conditions under which a personal frustration grows into violence against others, at least at the individual level. Overall analysis of the causes of genocide, as noted earlier, should include a number of disparate variables in order to get a complete picture of the dynamics involved. To implement genocide, all levels of a population, particularly the category of people comprising the bulk of the perpetrators, needs to be mobilized. SDO theory may be helpful in identifying factors that raise the levels of both individual and collective aggression.

A Lack of Emotional Development: The Cause of Participation in Genocide?

Half a century ago, psychoanalyst Erich Fromm foresaw that a universal lack of emotional development could create tendencies toward fascism and consumerism. Genocide, repeated throughout history, did not stop in the modern age but rather evolved into more imaginative and monstrous modes of implementation, proving Fromm right. When World War I ended in 1918, he was a deeply troubled young man obsessed by the question of how war was possible, by a wish to understand the irrationality of human behavior, and by a passionate desire for peace and international understanding. He became deeply suspicious of all ideologies and filled with the conviction that one must doubt *everything*.[83] He considered Einstein, Marx, and Freud to be the "architects of the modern age" because they were "imbued with the conviction of the fundamental orderliness of reality."[84]

Fromm sought to understand the laws that govern the life of an individual person and the laws of society, and how these correlate. He tried to arrive at a synthesis of the teachings of Marx and Freud; the former thought the basic reality to be the socioeconomic structure of society, while the latter believed it to be the libidinal organization of the individual. What Fromm found common to both thinkers was their implacable distrust of clichés, ideals, rationalizations, and ideologies that fill people's minds with the basis of what they *mistake* for reality. Both Marx and Freud insisted that a person lives under illusions, and that to overcome these illusions is a fundamental requirement for the achievement of true freedom. According to Fromm: "If [man] can recognize the illusions for what they are, that is to say, if he can wake up from the half-dream state, then he can come to his senses, become aware of his proper forces and powers, and change reality in such a way that illusions are no longer necessary. 'False consciousness,' that is to say, the distorted picture of reality, weakens man. Being in touch with reality, having an adequate picture of it, makes him stronger."[85]

Genocide is a cyclical process, not only inside the same culture, but among different cultures as well. Comparative studies about genocide sometimes focus on similarities and sometimes on differences in the causes of genocide. There is widespread agreement, however, that aggressive ideology and a culture of violence are driving forces behind any genocide. These factors also instill violence in preparation for genocide during peacetime. The more ideologized a society, the more forthcoming its permission for genocide. Fromm's false consciousness, that "distorted picture of reality," fills the gaps of human experience with illusions that make life bearable. "What are these ideologies which are fed into us?" asked Fromm. "Since there are so many, I will mention only a few of them: We are Christians: we are individualists; our leaders are wise; we are good; our enemies (whoever these happen to be at the moment) are bad; our parents love us and we love them; our marriage system is successful; and so on, and so on."[86]

The distortion or manipulation of reality that Fromm highlights is why so many people refuse to acknowledge genocide or, if they participate in it, why they try to convince themselves that they are doing it in pursuit of a higher purpose. People use false consciousness in peacetime as well, so that when faced with terror they repress awareness of something they would normally be cognizant of. If Fromm's postulate for analysis is applied to passive bystanders during genocide, it is fear that leads individuals toward dominant social discourse. Repression, even of acts believed to be wrong, is motivated, according to Fromm, by the "fear of isolation and ostracism." When awareness may result in separation of oneself from the group, repression is the only option for remaining ideologically cohesive with the "herd."[87] After all, the most powerful human fear is the fear of isolation: "For man, inasmuch as he is *man*—that is to say, inasmuch as he transcends nature and is aware of himself and of death—the sense of complete aloneness and separation is close to insanity."[88] Yet psychiatrists routinely rate war criminals as "normal" people. Does this mean that in a society open to genocide it is "normal" to be a perpetrator or a bystander, and that it is saviors who actually represent a deviation from "normal?"

Fromm underscores that, to be sane, a person needs to find union with others. This need is in fact a person's strongest drive, stronger than the desire for sex and often even stronger than the will to live. Fear of isolation triggers the individual to pretend not to see what his group claims does not exist, or accept as truth what the majority says is true even if it is clearly false. Indeed, "the herd is so vitally important for the individual that their views, beliefs, feelings, constitute reality for him, more so than what his senses and his reason tell him."[89] Fromm compares social patterning with a hypnotist's voice: "Just as in the hypnotic state of disassociation the hypnotist's voice and words take the place of reality, so the social pattern constitutes reality for most people. What man considers true, real, sane, are the clichés accepted by his society, and much that does not fit in with these clichés is excluded from awareness, is unconscious. There is almost nothing a man will not believe—or repress—when he is threatened with the explicit or implicit threat of ostracism."[90] Fromm extends this threat of ostracism to a threat of lost identity, because the fear of ostracism implies that the fear of lost identity as rejection of a person's beliefs denotes rejection of the person's *self*. According to Fromm, "the very combination of both fears has a most powerful effect."[91]

If Fromm's theory based on the fear of isolation is compared to Loevinger's theory of emotional development, it would follow that, in the midst of a genocide, only people who fall into tier I and tier II levels of emotional development are able to remain mentally healthy. This mental "health," however, is based on the use of false consciousness, and its price is a loss of freedom. It is only tier III personalities who can transcend dominant social stereotypes via cosmopolitanism; only these people are truly free. It is people who unchain themselves from false consciousness and reject the use of violence even for the purpose of achieving a "higher social goal" who are most completely in touch with their humanity. Fromm points out that a man is not only a member of society but also a member of the human race, and he asserts that "the ability to act according to one's conscience depends on the degree to which one has transcended the limits of one's society and has become a citizen of the world."[92] The difficulty of reaching such a level of intellectual and emotional development is exemplified by the role of "external passive bystanders" during the genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

EXTERNAL PASSIVE BYSTANDERS

The Nikola Popović case, discussed at the beginning of this chapter as an example of an ideologized ordinary perpetrator, also reveals the existence of another category—external passive bystanders. Popović was a witness for the prosecution at the trial of Naser Orić, despite the fact that there was every indication he was a biased witness who had himself participated in the July 1995 genocide against Bosniaks. That he testified before the ICTY as a prosecution witness, as opposed to facing prosecution in his own trial, speaks volumes about the ignorance of the international community concerning events in Bosnia and Herzegovina between 1992 and 1995. Popović's testimony, and that of others like him, suggests a continuity of such ignorance in some international political circles even after 1995. Although investigators and prosecutors in The Hague had the opportunity to play a much more active role, perhaps as "saviors after the fact," they often served as nothing more than external passive bystanders. ICTY courtrooms have often been a stage for the denial of reality by those whose duty was to do just the opposite—to demystify the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina. However, the tribunal has ironically been hampered by its attempts at ethnic parity, seen in the ethnic divisions within investigating and prosecuting teams. The goal is often to press charges that even out the ethnic playing field, so to speak, rather than to consider facts in the context of a broader reality. Thus, ICTY indictments very often limit the search for truth in this way. The use of this ethnic lens helps explain the decision by ICTY prosecutors, in the indictment against Naser Orić, commander of the Bosniak forces, to describe Serb villages around Srebrenica as green oases where unarmed Serb peasants lived in peaceful harmony before they were attacked by armed Bosniaks. This filtration of facts ignored the reality that many of those Serb peasants were active soldiers for the Serb cause, and that heavy artillery, used to kill starving Srebrenican citizens, was stationed by the Yugoslav People's Army on the hills in and around Serb villages. The defense for Orić summed it up this way:

> Srebrenica was surrounded by a deadly encirclement of fortified Serb towns and villages during the whole war. Serb brigades, battalions and other units were located in the surrounding towns and villages, enforcing the siege

> against Srebrenica's inhabitants. The brutal logic of a siege is that the besieged have two options: to wait for death or to take action against the besiegers. This case arises out of that military reality. The Prosecution has, throughout this case, sought to minimize the menace posed by the besieging Serbs to Srebrenica's inhabitants. It has constantly argued that the Serbs surrounding Srebrenica were simple peasants who posed no threat to their Muslim neighbors. According to the Prosecution, these local Serbs lived in rustic tranquility until their Muslim neighbors attacked them in a brutal and unprovoked manner.[93]

Prosecutors in The Hague, motivated by judicial expediency and perhaps willing to disregard a search for higher truth, attempted to prove genocide against Bosniaks in the Milošević case while they denied it had occurred in the Orić trial. The paradox is embodied by the use of Ambassador Diego Arria as a prosecution witness in the trial of Milošević and a defense witness in the Orić case. In the Orić trial, he faced questions during cross-examination by the prosecutor that Arria found analogous to doubts raised by Milošević himself. Arria had offered testimony to prove his slow-motion genocide thesis, describing the appalling conditions he witnessed in Srebrenica during his visit on April 25, 1993.[94] When the prosecutor persisted in attempts to show that this testimony was an exaggeration—that Arria had not spent enough time in Srebrenica to evaluate conditions there—the ambassador openly challenged the prosecutor. "You know, that question was posed to me exactly by Mr. Milošević. And of course I'm sure you don't want to imply the same thing that he did. He did imply to me openly that I had been there for too short a time to really provide an expert opinion. I told Mr. Milošević that it didn't take but a few hours to see human misery and destruction. . . . On the contrary, it seems that the people from the United Nations who saw that for a long time got used to the idea of seeing misery without reporting it."[95]

In addition to the internal passive bystanders exemplified by the testimonies of the Serb women detailed earlier in this chapter, some prosecutors in The Hague could be classified as external passive bystanders, who, for a variety of reasons, fed into stories of denial regarding what happened to Bosniaks during the 1992–1995 aggression. Straddling the line between a judicial mandate to develop cases against alleged offenders on both sides of the conflict and the human mandate to address a reality of brutal and unbalanced war crimes, lawyers in The Hague often chose the more politic option, advancing their careers and reputations through wins in court even at the risk of leaving any larger humanitarian questions unanswered. The case of Miroslav Deronjić, examined in the previous chapter, serves as an example of how this role—of the external passive bystanders—was manifested in indictments. Although Deronjić virtually confirmed in his testimony that he had played a significant role in the genocide perpetrated against Bosniaks in the safe area of Srebrenica in July 1995, the prosecution charged him only for the Glogova village massacre, in exchange for his confession. The purpose of such deals was to protect the financial interest of the ICTY by reducing the costs associated with investigations. Certainly, justice is never a pure endeavor, always fraught with pressures of the real world, monetary or otherwise. But the international community must decide at what point it is acceptable, if ever, for postwar reconciliation to be impeded in the name of budgetary constraints. And further, it must decide at what point decisions made in The Hague in the name of expediency must be seen for what they are: support for mechanisms of denial.

The phenomenon of external passive bystanders is well illustrated by the blockade of information about the Holocaust that occurred during World War II. Information on the fate of Jews and other victims was available, but Western leaders and media were unwilling to believe it. In June 1942, London's *Daily Telegraph* reported that seven hundred thousand Polish Jews had been slaughtered by the Germans in "the greatest massacre in world history." The *New York Times* also published a story about the massacre but buried it in the middle of the paper. Stanley Cohen believes this choice represented the compromise between "belief and disbelief." For if American journalists had believed the story was entirely true, it would have been front-page news. If they didn't believe it at all, the story would not have been published.[96] Their position, somewhere between belief and disbelief, was no doubt a result of denial on some level—denial that humans could do to one another what the massacre implied.

External bystanders used equivalent denial mechanisms in the cases of Rwanda and Bosnia and Herzegovina. Though the U.S. government responded to the Rwandan genocide, government officials instructed their spokespeople to describe the deaths of two hundred thousand Tutsis not as genocide but merely as "genocidal incidents," implying that something *like* genocide had occurred but falling short of making such a politically sensitive accusation.[97] Similarly, the U.S. government reaction to pictures of Serb concentration camps in Bosnia and Herzegovina employed a vague and noncommittal approach. A majority of Western journalists had refused to report on the first camps discovered, despite significant parallels with World War II–era German concentration camps, because they saw them as propaganda tools of the Bosnian government. The U.S. government knew about these camps well before pictures were available to the public,[98] but, "confronted by the televised faces behind barbed wire, Bush administration officials reacted instinctively: they denied knowing anything about the camps. Or rather, they first said they knew and then, next day, said they didn't."[99]

The international community did not deny genocide only to justify its lack of action to stop it. Its denial, in some instances, had a different motivation. For instance, after the second Markale market massacre in Sarajevo on August 28, 1995, U.N. experts were ostensibly unable to determine with certainty who had fired the mortar shells that killed forty-three and wounded seventy-five civilians. David Harland, head of U.N. civil affairs in Sarajevo during General Rupert Smith's term, was a witness at the trial of Serb general Dragomir Milošević. Harland explained why the United Nations' findings were reported as unclear. He said that General Smith made a "neutral statement" to the press even though "at that time he already had the technical report of the UNPROFOR intelligence section, determining beyond reasonable doubt that shells were fired from VRS positions at Lukavica."[100] Harland admitted that he felt responsible for encouraging the Serb propaganda myth—he had advised Smith to make a neutral statement about the bombing because he felt that blaming the Serbs for the Markale massacre would alarm them and possibly alert them to impending air strikes. Worried that this awareness by the Serbs would jeopardize the safety of U.N. troops, particularly of British soldiers around Goražde who might have been taken hostage by Serbs in the case of an early confrontation with them, Harland had advised General Smith to avoid overtly blaming the Serbs for the massacre.[101]

Given the U.N. Convention on Genocide and promises made by world leaders that nothing akin to the Holocaust will ever happen again, recognition of genocide amounts to a pledge by the international community to do better than take on the shameful position of external passive bystanders, and instead even to conduct military interventions to prevent genocide. The denial of genocide, the coining of new terms such as "ethnic cleansing," and only partial recognition of genocide (such as of the "genocidal incidents" in Rwanda) provide world leaders with the options of nonintervention or only partial intervention through fruitless "peace missions"—such as those that failed in both Bosnia and Rwanda.

Cohen offers several reasons why international governments turn a blind eye to genocide, including: "National self-interest; the view that the nation-state is not a moral agent with moral obligations; direct involvement and collusion (arms, training, equipment); reluctance to infringe the doctrine of national sovereignty along with the popular sentiment that these are indeed other people's problems."[102] Cohen also describes a variety of "relativisms" that serve as justification for noninvolvement policies. The "right-wing version" assigns a fatalistic "us" and "them" dividing line. The "liberal version" is a hands-off approach in the name of respect for the autonomy of other cultures. And the "mindless version" generously recognizes that "there is truth on both sides." Cohen asserts that the position of the state that holds onto the right to remain neutral in the face of genocide is analogous to that of the individual who clings to the " 'right to be an ostrich,' " with his or her head buried in the sand.[103]

Scholarly Denial of Genocide

Israel Charny is well known for his analysis of denial of the Holocaust and other genocides. Charny has focused especially on denial of the Holocaust and of the genocide perpetrated against Armenians in the Ottoman Empire. He has identified renowned academics who have built their careers on the denial of genocide, including Ernst Nolte, who denies the Holocaust; Bernard Lewis, who denies the Armenian Genocide; and one of the world's most famous academics, Noam Chomsky, who stands adamantly for the right of deniers to be allowed free speech even when that free speech is the hostile speech of denial.[104] Charny formulated five types of genocide denial, and he explained the defense mechanisms used by people in each category to justify their denial through a study of scholars who had denied the Armenian Genocide:

1. Innocence-and-Self-Righteousness
   The respondents claim that they only intend to ascertain the truth. Moreover, they do not believe that human beings could have been so evil as the descriptions of the genocide imply. Furthermore, even if many deaths took place a long time ago, it is important to put them aside now and forgive and forget.
2. Scientificism in the Service of Confusion
   The position taken is seemingly an innocent one that we do not know enough to know what the facts of history were, and rather than condemning anyone we should await the ultimate decision of research. This is a manipulative misuse of the valued principle in science that facts must be proven before they are accepted in order to obfuscate facts that are indeed known, and to confuse the minds of fair-minded people who do not want to fall prey to myths and propaganda. The very purpose of science, which is to know, is invoked in order to justify a form of know-nothingness.
3. Practicality, Pragmatism, and Realpolitik
   Here the claim is made that dealing with ancient history is impractical, it will not bring peace to the world in which we live today. One must be realistic and live through realpolitik.

4. Idea Linkage Distortion and Time-Sequence Confusion
   This is a dishonest linkage of different ideas, often out of time sequence, to excuse denials of the facts. Present needs, whether justified or not, are taken as a reasonable basis for censoring or changing the record of past history.
5. Indirection, Definitionalism, and Maddening
   These are responses that avoid the issue by failing to reply, or no less by going off on tangents about trivial details that avoid the essential issue whether genocide took place. The avoidance can also be done in a seductive manner of acknowledging that the issue should be discussed, but then it never is. *Definitionalism* refers to a form of maddening resistance to acknowledging a known genocide that is common for academics who enter definitional battles over whether or not a given event really fits the pure form of definition of genocide. So much energy goes into the definitional struggle, and so much emphasis is put on words that minimize the extent of the event, that first the significance of the event and its enormous human tragedy are written out of existence, and then the event itself becomes as if something else.

Every one of Charny's categories is exemplified by the reality that surrounds events in Bosnia and Herzegovina. I have provided numerous examples throughout this book illustrating the denialist attitudes not only of some Serbian academics but of some academics from the liberal, Western tradition as well. On the other hand, a number of well-known authors, such as Samantha Power, Martin Shaw, Marko Hoare, Gregory Stanton, and many others, have exposed the terrible political consequences that academic denial has had for the global prevention of genocide.

Neutrality and objectivity were often held up during the Bosnian genocide by Western journalists who insisted that all sides were equally guilty, refusing to label Serb forces as the only "bad guys." Marko Hoare addressed this paradox in an article on genocide denial in Yugoslavia: "If Ed Vulliamy reports on a contemporary Serbian concentration camp, then this is 'demonizing the Serbs' and proof that the Western media is biased against 'the Serbs,' but if Robert Fisk writes about Croatian concentration camps that existed half a century earlier during World War Two, as he did in *The Independent* at the height of the Bosnian war, then this is proof that 'the Croats' are really the bad guys and consequently that the rest of the media is biased against 'the Serbs' for not pointing this out."[105] Idea linkage distortion and time-sequence confusion as a method of denial is frequently used by authors who highlight genocide against Serbs during World War II as a justification for crimes against humanity and genocide committed by Serb forces during the Yugoslav wars of secession.

Authors promoting this view do not take into account that the Bosnian Muslim and Croatian populations were also victims of World War II–era genocidal policies, implemented by Serbian Chetniks.[106] They also overlook the fact that it was not only Croatia that was a quisling state during Nazi rule. Serbia too had a quisling regime that complied with the Nazis' anti-Semitic policies, and the targets of Chetnik exterminations were not only Muslims and Croats; the Chetniks also murdered Jews.[107]

At the time that genocide was most recently committed in Bosnia, British politics were especially rich in the reasoning of practicality, pragmatism, and realpolitik as described by Charny. In May 1995, senior Conservative member of Parliament Sir Geoffrey Johnson Smith asked during debates in the British Parliament on Bosnia: "If one third of the Bosnian population in the Bosnia-Herzegovina conflict—the Serbs—are not interested in living with the other two thirds, how can we make them?" Former Conservative prime minister Edward Heath added that "it is now absolutely impossible to judge and say, 'These are the people who ought to be supported for a particular reason.'" As the discussion heated up, senior Labour member of Parliament Tam Dalyell employed definitionalism in his realpolitik approach. He said, "Political friends of many years have asked me, 'How can you do anything that seems to endorse ethnic cleansing?' But is it ethnic cleansing? Are we quite sure about that, because the history of those particular Muslims is not ethnic?" What Dalyell's cynical denial communicated was that "ethnic cleansing" against Bosnian Muslims wasn't really a crime because they are not even an ethnic group in his view.[108] British decision makers would only go so far as to call the extermination of Bosnian civilians "ethnic cleansing." In the same manner as their American colleagues, they avoided what they called the "G-word" because the heavy qualification of genocide obliged them to a moral high road they refused to take.

The publication several years ago of presidential confidant Taylor Branch's record of Bill Clinton's time in the White House shed further light on the machinations of world power that influenced decision making during the war in Bosnia. According to Branch, Clinton himself confirmed that key European political players, primarily the United Kingdom and France, had clear anti-Muslim agendas in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Branch recalls:

> Clinton said U.S. allies in Europe blocked proposals to adjust or remove the [international arms] embargo [on the former Yugoslavia]. They justified their opposition on plausible humanitarian grounds, arguing that more arms would only fuel the bloodshed, but privately, said the president, key allies

> objected that an independent Bosnia would be 'unnatural' as the only Muslim nation in Europe. He said they favored the embargo precisely because it locked in Bosnia's disadvantage. Worse, he added, they parried numerous alternatives as a danger to the some eight thousand European peacekeepers deployed in Bosnia to safeguard emergency shipments of food and medical supplies. . . . While upholding their peacekeepers as a badge of commitment, they turned these troops effectively into a shield for the steady dismemberment of Bosnia by Serb forces. When I expressed shock at such cynicism, reminiscent of the blind-eye diplomacy regarding the plight of Europe's Jews during World War II, President Clinton only shrugged. He said President François Mitterrand of France had been especially blunt in saying that Bosnia did not belong, and that British officials also spoke of a painful but realistic restoration of Christian Europe. Against Britain and France, he said, German chancellor Helmut Kohl among others had supported moves to reconsider the United Nations arms embargo, failing in part because Germany did not hold a seat on the U.N. Security Council.[109]

It has been the tendency of American officials, including President Clinton, to place the blame on Europe for not having intervened in Bosnia and Herzegovina and for having supported the regime of Slobodan Milošević. But Pulitzer Prize–winning author David Halberstam sees no reason to give the United States this kind of amnesty. He quotes an interview with Richard Johnson, the Yugoslav desk officer at the State Department, who discussed the tiptoeing around nomenclature that took place in that period, explaining that "starting in the Bush years, but extending well into the Clinton years, an attempt was made to avoid or at least modify the G-word; that is, genocide. To admit outright that what the Serbs were doing was, in fact, genocidal was a critical decision because the need to act would be that much greater."[110]

One group of self-righteous authors who claim to take a neutral approach to historical cases of mass violence often argue over "the proper definition." Again, according to Charny, this kind of definitionalism is a form of genocide denial. Michael Mann, commenting on the judgment imposed on Radislav Krstić—who was found guilty of genocide in Srebrenica—wrote that he "would prefer to call [Srebrenica] a local genocidal outburst, set amidst a broader murderous cleansing of Muslims which was too erratic and regionally varied to be called genocide."[111]

Edward Herman and David Peterson, in their 2010 book *The Politics of Genocide*, caused impassioned reactions among genocide scholars with their brutal denial of genocides in Rwanda and Bosnia and Herzegovina.[112] In their attempt to discredit Western alliance "humanitarian interventions," they adhered to the approach of Holocaust exclusivists, according to which the only genocide in history remains that committed against the Jews by the Nazis. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, according to Herman and Peterson, the West demonized the Serbs and exaggerated "claims of Serb evil and violence . . . with fabricated 'concentration camps,' 'rape camps' and similar Nazi- and Auschwitz-like analogies."[113] They further claim that the verdicts of the ICTY that established crimes committed in Srebrenica as genocide are invalid, since all the women, children, and elderly men were evacuated to safety, and Serb forces killed only "Bosnian Muslim men of military age."[114] More shocking than the book itself, however, was that the foreword was written by Noam Chomsky, who asserted, "As for the term 'genocide,' perhaps the most honourable course would be to expunge it from the vocabulary until the day, if it ever comes, when honesty and integrity can become an international norm."[115]

GENOCIDE DENIAL IN SERBIA

From journalistic, academic, and international political discourse, the watered-down euphemism of ethnic cleansing paved the way for denial in the international legal arena as well. In judgments of the ICTY, a legal precedent is yet to be set that defines any crimes except those committed in July 1995 in Srebrenica as genocide. Yet during the trial of former Serbian president Slobodan Milošević a great deal of evidence was presented establishing that genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina had in fact commenced in the spring of 1992, and this was confirmed by an interim verdict reached in the case on June 16, 2004. This interim verdict named seven Bosnian towns in which genocide had occurred: Brčko, Prijedor, Sanski Most, Srebrenica, Bijeljina, Ključ, and Bosanski Novi.[116] Radovan Karadžić and Ratko Mladić have also been arrested and are standing trial for genocide in the ICTY. But the Convention on Genocide was applied in a state-versus-state proceeding for the first time in history in the case of the Bosnian genocide.

While the February 26, 2007, verdict in the case of Bosnia and Herzegovina versus Serbia, tried at the International Court of Justice (ICJ) in The Hague, confirmed that genocide occurred in Srebrenica in July 1995, it released the Serbian state from full responsibility. Instead, Serbia was held accountable only for failing to prevent genocide. Judges in the case openly admitted in their ruling that they had decided the case with insufficient evidence, yet they refused the request of Bosnian applicants to compel Serbia to disclose a version of the minutes of the Serbian Supreme Defense Council—the body in charge of the then Yugoslav Army—which had been submitted as evidence in the Milošević case. In submitting the document to the ICTY, Serbia had demanded guarantees that it would not be released to the ICJ, under the guise of national security.

This may sound perplexing, or even unlikely; thus, for the sake of understanding, let's apply this same standard to another, more well-known case. What if, after World War II, Israel had brought genocide charges against Germany in the ICJ? Let us imagine that the Nuremberg Tribunal held key evidence that it had used to prosecute individual Nazis, but that it refused to give this evidence to the ICJ because it had promised to protect the national interest of Germany. Imagine, too, that the ICJ refused to order Germany to disclose these key documents and that, based on incomplete evidence, the ICJ ruled that Germany was not responsible for the Holocaust. This sounds like a far-fetched scenario, but that's exactly what happened in the case of Bosnia and Herzegovina versus Serbia.[117] And this case will most certainly have serious and long-term consequences with regard to both the prevention and the prosecution of genocide.[118]

A last chance to utilize the international legal system to force Serbia to confront the truth about its past was missed with the ICJ verdict, and the Serbian public readily interpreted it as proof that Serbia had not been involved in the war against Bosnia and Herzegovina. Thus, following the verdict, denial in Serbia acquired a new dimension; even that portion of Serbian society which calls itself liberal—and which had previously seemed ready to discuss Serbia's responsibility for the aggression—found in the verdict the perfect way out of any mea culpas. Denial is now pervasive in Serbia, in political discourse, the media, the educational system, and the sphere of law.

Serbian national courts have strongly reflected the framework set by the ICJ verdict, and they are unanimous in their view that Serbia and its armed forces were not engaged in Bosnia. The most striking case is that of the Scorpions—Serbian special forces who fought in Croatia, Bosnia, and Kosovo. The verdict in the war crimes case against them was delivered in April 2007, just a month after the ICJ decision. Presiding judge Gordana Božilović-Petrović argued in her extensive exposition that, although most of the Scorpions later joined the Serbian secret police, they had no connection with the Serbian state at the time of the fighting.[119]

Serbian public opinion regarding their war criminals became the focus of world media in 2011 after the May 26 arrest near Belgrade of Bosnian Serb general Ratko Mladić, accused of genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Only ten days before his arrest, the results of a survey conducted in Serbia showed that, despite a reward of ten million euros offered by the Serbian government for information leading to Mladić's arrest, 78 percent of respondents said they would not disclose such information. Also, 51 percent said they strongly opposed his arrest, while 40 percent said they considered Mladić to be a hero. Only 7 percent of Serbian citizens said they would accept the reward and report Mladić's whereabouts.[120]

This strong support for Mladić was echoed in street interviews carried out in Serbia and Republika Srpska following his arrest. "I trembled inside when I heard that terrible news," said one Bosnian Serb woman, with tears in her eyes, when reporters interviewed her in the small town of Pale near Sarajevo.[121] Many ordinary men, women, and young people gave similar statements in the days following the arrest. Some of them were sad, like the woman in Pale; some were angry and upset.

How was it possible that, in spite of all the trials taking place both at the ICTY and in local courts related to the genocide in Srebrenica and the siege of Sarajevo, citizens of Serbia and the Republika Srpska seemed to know so little about the crimes of Mladić, Milošević, and Karadžić? There is no doubt that the Serbian media played a crucial role in this lack of knowledge among ordinary people. Only a few days before Mladić's arrest, Serbian state radio television, RTS, had actually indirectly admitted to this. In what many saw as an unexpected move, RTS publicly apologized for its wartime propaganda, as well as for the support it provided to the regime of former Serbian president Milošević.[122]

"We apologize to the people of Serbia and the people in neighbouring countries who were exposed to insults, slander, and hate speech," read the RTS statement, which was posted on its Web site on May 24, 2011. "We have repeatedly hurt the feelings, integrity, and dignity of intellectuals, the opposition, independent journalists, and national and religious minorities," it continued. In an effort to distance itself from its former warmongering, RTS promised to be "committed to promoting the rule of law, social justice, human and minority rights and freedoms, in line with European values."[123]

The apology was the first by Serbia's state broadcaster, which was one of the most potent symbols of the Milošević era and a key pillar of his long rule—marked by the wars in Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia, and Kosovo, as well as international isolation and economic downfall. But the apology not only came too late, it was not accompanied by any real change to the broadcaster's approach to analysis of the Serbian role in the wars of the 1990s.

In the year after the RTS apology, the Serbian political and cultural scene became further radicalized; in the May 2012 election, Tomislav Nikolić, a former ally of accused war criminal Vojislav Šešelj, became the new Serbian president. More than 50 percent of Serbians voted for the extreme right-wing nationalist candidate—further evidence of the population's unwillingness to confront its country's recent history. This is not to say that the government of former president Boris Tadić was all that willing to admit to Serbia's participation in the wars and genocide in Croatia, Bosnia, and Kosovo either, but his government managed to maintain a democratic pretense for the purposes of E.U. integration. In 2010, Tadić issued two apologies and paid respects to Croat and Bosnian Muslim victims of the wars. He visited the memorial for 260 victims of the notorious massacre in Vukovar and attended the commemoration of the Srebrenica genocide. Yet Tadić's rhetoric did not match his actions. Only two days after apologizing to the victims of genocide in Srebrenica, he met with Milorad Dodik, the Bosnian Serb political leader and consistent genocide denier, to confirm their alliance.

Silence in Serbia over its role as an aggressor in the 1990s means that the motivations for war that inspired the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1991 still exist; Serbian territorial ambitions toward Bosnia and Herzegovina certainly did not end because the war ended. The most honest revelation of the position of Serbian political elites was offered by former Serbian minister of foreign affairs Goran Svilanović, who admitted that "all governments in Serbia after Slobodan Milošević, even though they disagreed on many ideological issues, agreed on their position toward Bosnia and Herzegovina. They all—whether it was Vojslav Koštunica or Boris Tadić—view Republika Srpska as the war booty of Serbia."[124]

AFTERWORD: FROM VIŠEGRAD TO SYDNEY AND BACK

Indira Haračić, a clinical psychologist in Australia who has treated victims of genocide from Bosnia and Herzegovina, sees firsthand how the denial of genocide as identified by Israel Charny in his research has had an adverse effect on the psychological condition of her patients.[1] In her view, most Australians treat Bosnian victims living there with the attitude that Charny refers to as innocence-and-self-righteousness—for the sake of psychological recovery, they think, the best choice is to forgive and forget. Coupled with confusion and lack of understanding about the circumstances of the war, this mindset has added to the suffering of traumatized Bosnian refugees, who "do not understand how, after all these years, Australians are still not aware of what happened there." What are painful, too, says Haračić, are realpolitik discussions about the division of Bosnia and Herzegovina, according to which "division is an inevitable reality." And Haračić asserts that it is particularly difficult for her Bosnian patients to accept the argument—in line with Charny's idea linkage distortion thesis—that "only the division could have stopped the 'ethnic cleansing.'"

But what victims are most hurt by, she says, is

> avoiding to label genocide by its actual name. In regular conversation people are often told it was nothing but a civil war; women are raped in every war; it is not an act of genocide, but "only" a war crime. People who were in concentration camps, women who were raped during genocide, have a very hard time accepting this. They see it as an attempt to minimize their suffering. The denial of genocide often slows down and sometimes completely obstructs the process of treating the trauma. The denial of genocide reminds them that the cause of the injustice that made them suffer atrocities is still

> present in international politics and their everyday life. The fact they are so far away from Bosnia does not minimize the pain. If anything it makes it more difficult to deal with. One of my patients was a prisoner in two concentration camps, his sister was raped, and his father's throat was slit before his eyes. He suffers from severe insomnia. After one session, he told me: "Let's face it. Dividing Bosnia and Herzegovina along ethnic lines was more important than serving justice and stopping genocide."[2]

For the most part, Australians (or Americans or Britons, and the rest) do not deny genocide in the active and intentional way that marks much Serb rhetoric to this day. Instead, theirs is a denial rooted largely in lack of awareness. Although many people outside Europe are familiar with the Ottoman and Austro-Hungarian Empires and have read of Sarajevo in their history books (especially because of that infamous shot commonly believed to have "started World War I"), the complex and even thorny relations between ethnicities in the Balkans are often difficult to understand, and thus few people know how to begin unraveling the region's history.

A WEEKEND GETAWAY

In the summer of 2008, Kym Vercoe, an actress with the Sydney-based theater company Version 1.0, was at a seminar in Belgrade. She wanted to use her free weekend to visit Bosnia and Herzegovina, and her friends in Belgrade recommended Višegrad, the town closest to Serbia. That July weekend, Kym treated herself to a literary trip to the Ottoman Empire. She was rereading Ivo Andrić's book *The Bridge over the Drina*.[3]

Kym did not know much about what had taken place in the 1990s. Of course, she knew there had been a war and that people had lost their lives, but she thought Višegrad had been a Serb-populated town even before the conflict. Bosnia's recent history was far too complicated to fully grasp, and from the superficial reporting she had seen by the Australian media about the war, Kym understood just that "grave crimes" and "ethnic cleansing" had taken place. "I knew Serbs were the ones who had committed the majority of crimes. Our media focused on the genocide in Srebrenica and the siege of Sarajevo. I was confused by the geography of Bosnia and not familiar with the war story of Višegrad. I did not think that crimes had happened there," she admits. Her sheepish smile reveals a sense of guilt—a universal guilt triggered by lack of knowledge. "People in Višegrad were kind," she notes. "There were a lot of people in the town since an Orthodox holiday, St. Peter's Day, was being marked."[4]

A SLEEPLESS NIGHT

Kym likes traveling alone. Her cosmopolitan spirit is open to regions and people as yet unknown to her. This is why she remembers so well the night she spent in the Vilina Vlas hotel in July 2008.

An endemic and delicate fern called Vilina Vlas, which grows in thermal spring water, chose this site in Višegrad as its habitat. The stalk is about twenty centimeters (eight inches) long, and at its base is similar to what looks like the black hair of a woman. About thirty years ago, there were multiple habitats for the ferns on the sinter rocks around the hotel; now, only one habitat remains, at the waterfall beneath the Turkish bath.

Kym found information on the hotel in a guidebook she had purchased in Australia. During our interview, she showed me the guide, which highly recommends the spot to foreign tourists: "You see, they do not mention the crimes. After a relaxed day in Višegrad I booked a room in Vilina Vlas. When I entered the hotel room, however, I felt a deep discomfort. I was overwhelmed by an unexplainable anxiety, followed by physical exhaustion. But I did not sleep a blink. I could not wait for dawn to break. I took the first bus back to Belgrade."

Like many curious tourists, Kym wanted to fill in the gaps in her knowledge of the town she had just visited, especially of the hotel in which she had suffered insomnia. Back in Sydney, she searched online for "Vilina Vlas and Višegrad." Opening Web site after Web site in horrified silence, Kym learned that she had spent the night in what had been a camp where Bosnian Muslim women were raped. "When I read that, I felt like I was breaking down. I remembered the negative energy I sensed in that hotel room; but some pretty banal things were crossing my mind as well. I took a bath in that bathroom. I washed my shirt and took it out to the balcony to dry. In order to avoid rape and torture, women used to jump out of those windows to their deaths; it was possible that some of them had jumped from that very balcony. It was also possible that some had been raped in the bed that I had been lying in."

The unrest caused by these ghastly revelations did not leave Kym. To calm her conscience, she knew she had to return to Višegrad—to honor all the women killed in Vilina Vlas, to pay heed to all the men, women, and children killed and thrown by Serb soldiers into the Drina River from the bridge, and to pay respects to all the Bosnian Muslims burnt in their own homes. As time passed, her need to return, to look into the eyes of the Serbs living in Višegrad, grew.

From 2008 to 2010 Kym read prolifically about the aggression and genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina. I met Kym on her second visit to Bosnia and

Herzegovina, in May 2010, when she arrived first in Sarajevo. Our meeting was prompted by an article I had cowritten with Rachel Irwin, entitled "Višegrad in Denial Over Grisly Past."[5] The article talks about the attitudes of people in Višegrad toward their wartime past. Denial is pervasive there, and only one Serb, who asked us not to reveal his identity, was willing to testify to the grave crimes and mass killings he had witnessed.

When I met Kym, I thought she wanted me to provide some contacts for her in Višegrad. But instead she asked me about the people Rachel and I had met there and about their reactions to our questions. Kym's mission was different this time; she wanted to go back and observe—both herself and the population of Višegrad. Unlike in 2008, when she was ignorant of the past, she was returning with full knowledge about the crimes that had taken place there. After all, the focus of her research for two years had been the genocidal rape of Bosnian Muslim women.

I saw Kym again after her second visit to Višegrad. "I was very suspicious toward the men I was meeting there," she related. "Whenever I'd establish eye contact with one of them while passing by, I would wonder what their role in the war was. Could that man be one of the ones who did the killing? With all the information I had I could visualize the horrors of the summer of 1992. Whenever I would feel overwhelmed by these thoughts, I would remember the Serb you and Rachel had interviewed, the one who had helped his neighbors in the war, who is today willing to admit that the crimes did happen and to say that many Višegrad Serbs were involved in various ways in genocide against the Muslims. This helped me. . . . I tried to avoid seeing every man I met in the street as a criminal. I would think that each of them could be the one from your story, the one who differed from the others."

WAR CRIMINALS

On March 12, 2010, halfway between Sarajevo and Višegrad, a line of cars awaited Mitar Vasiljević, a convicted war criminal. That night, entertained by trumpeters from Užice, a feast was taking place—the people were celebrating the return of a war criminal who had been sentenced, in 2004, to fifteen years' imprisonment for crimes against humanity and violations of the laws and customs of war, for activities in Višegrad in 1992. He was released after serving just two-thirds of his sentence. On the Web site of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, Kym had read that Vasiljević, together with Milan Lukić, participated in the killing of five Bosnian Muslim men. After imprisoning seven of them in the Vilina Vlas hotel, Vasiljević led them to the bank of the Drina at gunpoint. He ordered them to stand in a line and opened fire, killing five. Two men survived by pretending to be dead in the water.

In November 2001, Vasiljević told judges in The Hague that he had heard that Milan Lukić, the head of a Serb paramilitary group in Višegrad, had raped, killed, and then looted the possessions of his numerous victims. According to Vasiljević, after the Serb attack on the village of Mušići, Lukić abducted and raped several girls. Lukić was sentenced to life in prison and his cousin Sredoje to thirty years for crimes they committed in Višegrad. The ICTY judgment in the case states that, besides numerous other crimes, Milan Lukić killed around seventy women, children, and old men in a house on Pionirska Street by forcing them into the house, setting the building on fire, and shooting at all those who were trying to escape. He also forced seventy Bosnian Muslim men and women of different ages into a house in Bikavac, blocked all the exits, and threw several bombs inside.

It has been proven that Lukić's command station was the Vilina Vlas hotel, but ICTY prosecutors failed nonetheless to incorporate the crime of rape into the indictment, and justifications for this omission were vague and unfounded. A few women survived their rapes in Vilina Vlas and were willing to testify; some of them told their stories in a special edition of *BIRN*, the publication of the Balkan Investigative Reporting Network, entitled "Nobody Hears the Cry of Victims from Višegrad." Lukić slaughtered the sixteen-year-old son of a woman in front of her. Afterward, he took her to Vilina Vlas. "They repeatedly raped me there," she told *BIRN*. She remembers "a lot of women in the hotel" and "blood all over the place," as well as that "all the rooms in the hotel were locked. They would throw pieces of bread into our rooms and we had to catch them with our teeth, because our hands were tied. They would untie us only when they wanted to rape us."[6] Following sentencing of the Lukić cousins, Amnesty International asked the Prosecutor's Office in Bosnia and Herzegovina to open an investigation into the rapes that witnesses claim they committed in Višegrad.

On January 12, 2009, a member of the Republika Srpska police force, Željko Lelek, was sentenced to sixteen years by the Court of Bosnia and Herzegovina for crimes against humanity in Višegrad. His indictment did include the crime of rape. The Court Council accepted the testimony of M. H., whom Lelek raped at Vilina Vlas, and who testified about other women having been subjected to the same torture. She and another witness were present when Lelek raped Jasmina Ahmetspahić. According to the judgment in the case, other witnesses also corroborated these events: "Defense witness Petar Mitrović confirms these statements when he says that, together with the accused, he went to the hotel, where they heard their neighbors had been killed and Jasmina

Ahmetspahić had jumped out of the window."[7] In his testimony, Mitrović linked the accused with the time and place of the crimes from the indictment.

Kym tried not to generalize and did not want to look at the population of Višegrad through the prism of collective responsibility, but "it is hard not to generalize, because the feast organized in honor of Vasiljević clearly demonstrates the fact that most Višegrad Serbs still support those who have committed crimes against Bosniaks. The crimes committed during the war were so public that it is not possible that there were many people in Višegrad who did not know what was going on. It is possible that they were afraid to protest during the war. But why don't they protest now?"

Kym told me she had read a story on the commemoration organized on May 25, 2008, for the victims killed in Višegrad. The event was organized by Women Victims of War, Višegrad '92, Women in Black from Belgrade, and other nongovernmental organizations. The victims' family members along with a number of activists threw three thousand flowers into the Drina River from the Mehmed Paša Sokolović Bridge. As the flowers floated down the river, Serbs loudly played the song "Drina, Bloody Drina" from a nearby café, and then took to boats to scoop the flowers out of the water to sell them.

"Of course I know that not all of the present inhabitants of Višegrad were in the town during the war," Kym observed. "Some are refugees from other parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina who came to Višegrad after the war. But I can see that the TV and the radio station, as well as the press, regularly report on trials, judgments and the discovery of mass graves. It is impossible that these people, after receiving so much information, are still living in ignorance."

In the summer of 2010, Kym spent five days in Višegrad alone. Although she had learned only a few words from her English-Bosnian dictionary, which she used in her brief contact with locals, she was able to understand quite a lot. The adjective "Bosnian" should never be used, she found—when she ordered a cup of Bosnian coffee, she would be corrected: "This is domestic, not Bosnian, coffee." The town of Višegrad is very isolated, and its inhabitants are suspicious toward foreigners; in order to feel safe, Kym had to smile a lot and repeat often that she was merely a tourist from Australia. And although the people of Višegrad do not want to remember the 1990s and deny the crimes that took place then, after loosening up a bit with the "Australian tourist," they began talking about "the Turks," Ivo Andrić, and *The Bridge over the Drina*.

The fact that crimes in Višegrad are not spoken of does not mean that there are no monuments to them. "I was walking through what remained of old streets where Muslims had lived," Kym related, and "one day I was looking at what was left of a house that had been burnt down and a woman next door was cleaning her front yard. The man next to her, possibly her husband, was sharpening an ax. I was looking at the burnt house next to theirs and could not help but wonder why such buildings were not completely torn down, since they represent a monument, reminding us of what was done to the people living there. And then it occurred to me that it was possible that many Višegrad Serbs do not even see the burnt houses; as if there was a black curtain between them and the ruins."

TWO HUNDRED FLOWERS

On the last day of her stay in Višegrad, Kym took a cab ride to the Vilina Vlas hotel. She rented a room and paid in advance. She had picked a bouquet of flowers from the meadow, and now she placed it on her bed. She filmed herself as she counted the flowers and spread them around the room. This would be her commemoration to the women who were murdered there—two hundred flowers for two hundred women raped and killed.

At first she could not bear the atmosphere and energy in the room. She took a walk and tried to find a church; when she couldn't find one, she returned to the hotel, lay down, and fell asleep, emotionally exhausted. "I do not know how long I was asleep, but the first thing I noticed when I woke up were notches on the wall. They were made with a pen. I thought that maybe one of the rapists had made a notch each time that he raped a woman. Or maybe they were for each of the women he had killed?"

This thought woke her completely. Her trip was personal, but she had also taken on the professional responsibility of making video footage for use in an upcoming play, meant to convey a message of moral responsibility to Australian audiences. "And I did," she told me, "in that surreal atmosphere, I made that footage. . . . Because of the specific nature of this crime and the protection of the victims' identities, I could not get a list of their names. But I wanted to count every single flower, to commemorate each one of them."

We were having coffee in the Vienna Café at Hotel Europe in Sarajevo. She powered up her camera, and on its tiny monitor I saw her sitting in the hotel room, counting yellow flowers. "Does this seem worthless?" Kym asked me. Her big eyes were filled with tears. It was much more than sadness she had tapped into; her message had a clear and deep meaning, a meaning deeper than the Drina River. For a few hours on that summer day in 2010, one room in the Vilina Vlas hotel was a monument, where a quiet commemoration was held for all those women who were victimized by Milan Lukić and his cousin Sredoje, and who were forgotten by the ICTY.

The play that Kym made, inspired by this story, was widely seen and was repeatedly performed in Sydney and Sarajevo.[8] Award-winning Bosnian director Jasmila Žbanić saw it and wanted to base a film on it. So Kym returned to Višegrad again in December 2011, this time with Jasmila and her film crew. Filming had to be done in secret; Žbanić is well known for her previous film *Grbavica*—which also addresses the mass rape of Bosnian Muslim women by Serbian soldiers during the war—and given the level of nationalism in Višegrad, her public appearance there was out of the question. Instead, Jasmila asked a Serbian friend from Belgrade to be her "cover" and act as the director of a tourism film about Višegrad. "It was a weird feeling," Jasmila told me later. "Twenty years after the war, in my own country, I had to hide my name, hoping nobody would recognize me. I was sad, angry, and afraid for the security of my crew. But we all agreed it was worth the risk. It is a story that needs to reach a wider audience."[9]

Efforts like those of Kym and Jasmila to tell the stories of women victims of the war in Bosnia are part of a larger mandate to bring awareness of genocide, and of the social paradigms that give rise to mass criminality and then support its denial. The complicated relationships within Bosnian society that have left many people around the world confused as to "who did what to whom" also served as a smokescreen for many perpetrators of genocide there, who convinced much of the international community that historic injustices experienced by all nations were reflected in equal crimes in the 1992–1995 war. But the nuances of relationships between people everywhere are growing only more complex; and a lack of understanding of these relationships must not be a reason that the international community fails to act when genocide occurs—no matter who the victims—and argues about the definition of genocide instead. Kym is right that "had the crimes in 1992 been labeled properly, as genocide, the international community would have intervened." And had the international community intervened in 1992, the indescribable suffering of so many innocent civilians would have been circumvented, just as it was when NATO finally intervened in 1995. I hope that by my raising awareness about genocide and the mechanisms of its denial in Bosnia, future generations around the world will better understand how to build social environments in which genocides are unthinkable—environments in which communities of saviors will have the upper hand.

NOTES

PREFACE

1. There were many manipulations of the number of people killed in the Bosnian War, with figures ranging from as high as two hundred and fifty thousand to as low as ninety-seven thousand. The most reliable database, which recorded casualties of war by each of their names, was created by the Research and Documentation Center in Sarajevo. By 2007, the center had collected the names of ninety-seven thousand individuals, but stated clearly that the database was still a work in progress. The center's *Bosnian Book of the Dead* was available at its official Web site, www.idc.com.ba. That link is no longer available, however, and the organization, faced with a number of controversies, seems to have abandoned the project. International sources, when talking about the number of dead in the Bosnian War, round the number up to "around one hundred thousand." In this book, I do not discuss statistical methods, nor have I done this kind of research myself. According to the Convention on Genocide, the intent of the perpetrator determines genocide. Considering that this book is researched within a qualitative methodological framework, I found it unnecessary to discuss controversies regarding the numbers of dead. It is even more difficult to establish the number of raped women, though numbers as high as fifty thousand and as low as twenty thousand are quoted. But the crime of rape is often a gray zone because many women do not report it due to social stigma. What has been established without doubt is that the Bosnian Serb Army used rape as a weapon of war and that many Bosnian Muslim and Croat women were raped in a systematic campaign. I discuss this issue in more depth in chapter 4, within the case study of the town of Foča.
2. Ed Vulliamy, "Face to Face with Radovan Karadzic," *Observer*, December 4, 2011, http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/dec/04/karadzic-bosnia-war-crimes-vulliamy (accessed January 26, 2012).
3. Robert J. Donia, "Republika Srpska Assembly, 1992–1995: Highlights and Excerpts," Report, Exhibit P537.2a, *Prosecutor v. Milošević,* No. IT-02-54 (July 29, 2003), 5–6.
4. Greil Marcus, *Lipstick Traces: A Secret History of the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990), 20.

CHAPTER 1. THE FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS

1. The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide; full text available at: http://www.preventgenocide.org/law/convention/text.htm (accessed November 16, 2009).
2. Martin Gilbert, *The Churchill War Papers: The Ever-Widening War* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2000), 1099–1106.
3. Samantha Power, *A Problem from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide* (New York: Basic Books, 2002), 29.
4. Ibid., 21.
5. Raphael Lemkin, *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe* (Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1944), 79.
6. Raphael Lemkin, "Genocide as a Crime under International Law," *American Journal of International Law*, no. 41 (1947): 147.
7. For a more detailed review of the background of the establishment of the Nuremberg court, see: George Ginsberg, "The Nuremberg Trial," in *The Nuremberg Trial and International Law,* ed. George Ginsberg and V. N. Kudriavtsev (Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff, 1990); on controversies regarding the ex post facto principle in Nuremberg and "winner's justice," see: Edina Bećirević, *Međunarodni krivični sud: Između ideala i stvarnosti* (Sarajevo: Arka Press and International Peace Center, 2003).
8. Power, *Problem from Hell*, 531.
9. Ibid.
10. For a detailed survey of political discussions, see: ibid., chapter 5.
11. Ibid., 69. Yet it seems that researchers' efforts have resulted in ever more loose interpretations of the Convention, so that, by international political standards, crimes committed in Cambodia by the Khmer Rouge regime are considered genocide today. In fact, the United Nations established a tribunal for Cambodia meant to investigate and process this genocide. See: "Judges Sworn in for Historic Khmer Rouge Genocide Tribunal," Associated Press, July 3, 2006; Ek Madra, "Khmer Rouge Trials Agreed at Last," Reuters, March 16, 2007.
12. Lawrence J. LeBlanc, *The United States and the Genocide Convention* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1991).
13. Stephen T. Katz, *The Holocaust in Historical Context* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994).
14. See: *Statement by Professor Bernard Lewis, Princeton University, Distinguishing Armenian Case from Holocaust*, April 14, 2002. Available at: http://www.ataa.org/reference/pdf/lewis.pdf (accessed on August 30, 2012).
15. An extraordinary analysis of the role of the Holocaust using the comparative method, as well as a criticism of Katz's and Lewis's approach regarding the "inimitability of the Holocaust," can be found in: Bernard Bruneteau, *Stoljeće genocida* (Zagreb: Politička kultura, 2005); see: chapter 4.
16. Martin Shaw, *What Is Genocide?* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007), 38.
17. Israel W. Charny, "Toward a Generic Definition of Genocide," in *Genocide: Conceptual and Historical Dimensions*, ed. George Andreopoulos (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994), 91.

18. Frank Chalk and Kurt Jonassohn, *The History and Sociology of Genocide: Analyses and Case Studies* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 18.
19. Leo Kuper, *Genocide: Its Political Use in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Penguin Books, 1981), 11–18.
20. Leo Kuper, *The Prevention of Genocide* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985).
21. Kuper, *Genocide: Its Political Use*, 17, 46, and 102.
22. Helen Fein, "Genocide: A Sociological Perspective," *Current Sociology* 38, no. 1 (Spring 1990): 24.
23. Quoted in: Adam Jones, *Genocide: A Comprehensive Introduction*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2011), 20.
24. For the reasons behind changes to the definition on genocide, see: Chalk and Jonassohn, *The History and Sociology of Genocide*; Charny, "Toward a Generic Definition of Genocide"; and Irving Louis Horowitz, *Taking Lives: Genocide and State Power* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 1997).
25. Leo Kuper, quoted in: Jones, *Genocide*, 16.
26. Alex Alvarez, *Governments, Citizens and Genocide. A Comparative and Interdisciplinary Approach* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001), 28–55.
27. Kuper, *Genocide: Its Political Use*.
28. Ben Kiernan, *Blood and Soil: A World History of Genocide and Extermination from Sparta to Darfur* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007).
29. Dirk A. Moses, *Genocide and Settler Society: Frontier Violence and Stolen Indigenous Children in Australian History* (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2004); Mark Levene, *Genocide in the Age of the Nation State*, vol. 1, *The Meaning of Genocide* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2005).
30. Benjamin Madley, "Patterns of Frontier Genocide 1803–1910: The Aboriginal Tasmanians, The Yuki of California, and the Herero of Namibia," *Journal of Genocide Research* 6, no. 2 (June 2004): 167–92.
31. Jones, *Genocide*, 65.
32. Horowitz, *Taking Lives*, 16.
33. Ibid.
34. Chalk and Jonassohn, *The History and Sociology of Genocide*, 23.
35. Jack Nusan Porter's definition of genocide (1981) is quoted in: Jones, *Genocide*, 17.
36. Helen Fein, *Genocide: A Sociological Perspective* (London: Sage, 1993), 44.
37. Helen Fein, "Testing Theories Brutally: Armenia (1915), Bosnia (1992) and Rwanda (1994)," in *Studies in Comparative Genocide*, ed. Levon Chorbajian (London: Macmillan Press, 1999), 159.
38. Christian Gerlach, *Extremely Violent Societies: Mass Violence in the Twentieth Century World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 4.
39. Michael Mann, *The Dark Side of Democracy: Explaining Ethnic Cleansing* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 7.
40. Irving Louis Horowitz, *Genocide: State Power and Mass Murder* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 1976), 66.
41. Norman Cohn, *Warrant for Genocide* (New York: Harper and Row, 1967), 263–64.

42. Ton Zwaan, "On the Aetiology and Genesis of Genocides and Other Mass Crimes Targeting Specific Groups," Expert Report, Exhibit P639, *Prosecutor v. Milošević*, No. IT-02-54 (January 20, 2004), 21.
43. Fein, *Genocide: A Sociological Perspective*, 50.
44. Roger Smith, "Fantasy, Purity, Destruction: Norman Cohn's Complex Witness to the Holocaust," presentation at the Nineteenth Annual Scholars Conference on the Holocaust (Philadelphia, March 5–7, 1989). Quoted in Fein, *Genocide: A Sociological Perspective*, 50.
45. In the absence of an English term for the planners and executors of genocide, Helen Fein and some other authors use the French word *genocidaires*.
46. Fein, *Genocide: A Sociological Perspective*, 39.
47. Alex Alvarez, *Genocidal Crimes* (New York: Routledge, 2010), 25.
48. Ibid.
49. Daniel J. Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust* (New York: Vintage Books, 1997); Christopher R. Browning, *Ordinary Men: Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland* (New York: HarperCollins, 1992).
50. Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners*.
51. Browning, *Ordinary Men*.
52. See: Emir Suljagic, "Community of Murder" (master's thesis, University of Sarajevo/University of Bologna, 2005).
53. See: Stanley Milgram, "Behavioral Study of Obedience," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 67, no. 4 (Oct. 1963): 371–78.
54. Stanley Milgram, *Obedience to Authority: An Experimental View* (New York: Harper and Row, 1974). For analysis of the ethical dimension of Milgram's experiment, see: C. D. Herera, "Ethics, Deception and 'Those Milgram Experiments,' " *Journal of Applied Philosophy* 18, no. 3 (2001): 245–56.
55. Milgram, *Obedience to Authority*, 142.
56. Philip Zimbardo, "Understanding How Good People Turn Evil: Renowned Psychologist Philip Zimbardo on His Landmark Stanford Prison Experiment, Abu Ghraib and More," interview by Amy Goodman, Democracy Now, March 30, 2007. See transcript (of radio program) at: http://www.democracynow.org/article.pl?sid=07/03/30/1335257 (accessed June 20, 2007).
57. Philip Zimbardo, *The Lucifer Effect: Understanding How Good People Turn Evil* (New York: Random House, 2008), 210–11.
58. Jones, *Genocide*, 401.
59. Gregory Stanton, "Eight Stages of Genocide," *Genocide Watch*, 1998, http://www.genocidewatch.org/genocide/8stagesofgenocide.html (accessed January 12, 2009).
60. Zwaan, "On the Aetiology and Genesis of Genocides."
61. Shaw, *What Is Genocide?* 34.

CHAPTER 2. THE DISSOLUTION OF YUGOSLAVIA AND THE PROPAGANDA OF DEHUMANIZATION

1. See: Mirsad Abazović, *Kadrovski rat za BiH: 1945–1991* (Sarajevo: Savez logoraša Bosne i Hercegovine CID, 1999), 72. Unless otherwise indicated, all translations of Bosnian, Serbian, and Croatian sources are my own.
2. Christopher Bennett, *Yugoslavia's Bloody Collapse: Causes, Course and Consequences* (New York: New York University Press, 1995), 54–55.
3. There are no precise statistics on how many Albanians and Muslims from Sandžak moved to Turkey. Estimates vary from 120,000 to 213,000. See: Petrit Imami, *Srbi i Albanci kroz vekove* (Belgrade: Samizdat B92, 1999), 323.
4. Raif Dizdarević, *From the Death of Tito to the Death of Yugoslavia* (Sarajevo: Šahinpašić, 2009), 362.
5. See: Sabrina P. Ramet, *The Three Yugoslavias: State-Building and Legitimation, 1918–2005* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006).
6. Dobrica Ćosić, *Piščevi zapisi 1951–1986* (Belgrade: Filip Višnjić, 2000), 263.
7. Dizdarević, *From the Death of Tito*, 119.
8. Ramet, *The Three Yugoslavias*, 228.
9. There were only three official languages in Communist Yugoslavia: Slovenian, Macedonian, and Serbo-Croatian.
10. Sonja Biserko, "The Dissolution of Yugoslavia: Roots of the Conflict," paper presented at the Humanity in Action International Conference, Sarajevo, June 28, 2012.
11. See: Jelena Lovrić, "Things Fall Apart," in *Why Bosnia?* ed. Rabia Ali and Lawrence Lifschultz (Stony Creek, CT: Pamphleteer's Press, 1993), 278–86.
12. Ivo Banac, *The National Question in Yugoslavia* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984), 407.
13. Ibid.
14. Rabia Ali, "Separating History from Myth: An Interview with Ivo Banac," in *Why Bosnia?* ed. Ali and Lifschultz, 141.
15. Ibid.
16. Some Croatian Communists also denied the right of nationality to Bosnian Muslims, but their resistance was not comparable to that of their much more aggressive Serbian counterparts. Macedonian Communists were also very much against the decision to grant nationality to Muslims in Yugoslavia because of the complicated national relations in their republic and the large percentage of the population made up of Albanians and Muslims.
17. According to the census, there were 161,036 Serbian-Muslims, 29,071 Croatian-Muslims, and 37,096 Macedonian-Muslims.
18. Census results as quoted in: Nijaz Duraković, *Prokletstvo Muslimana* (Tuzla: Harfo-Graf, 1998).
19. In the 1961 census there were 972,954 individuals in all of Yugoslavia and 842,954 in Bosnia and Herzegovina who identified themselves as ethnically Muslim. Ibid., 227.
20. Ilija Garašanin was an influential minister in the principality of Serbia under the rule of Prince Aleksandar Karađorđević. For detailed analysis of the role of Načertanije in the development of Serb nationalism, see: Paul N. Hehn, "The Origin of Modern

Pan-Serbism—The 1844 Nacertanije of Ilija Garasanin: An Analysis and Translation," *East European Quarterly* 9, no. 2 (1975).

21. For further reading on this, see: Philip J. Cohen, *Serbia's Secret War: Propaganda and the Deceit of History* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1996).
22. Norman Cigar, *Genocide in Bosnia: The Policy of Ethnic Cleansing* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1995), 17.
23. Fouad Ajami, "In Europe's Shadows," in *The Black Book of Bosnia: The Consequences of Appeasement*, ed. Nader Mousavizadeh (New York: Basic Books, 1996), 47.
24. Cigar, *Genocide in Bosnia*, 18.
25. Abazović, *Kadrovski rat za BiH*, 72.
26. For years, there was consensus among respectable historians that this directive indeed existed. In his highly acclaimed book *Bosnia: A Short History* (New York: New York University Press, 1996), Noel Malcolm raised doubts about its authenticity. Malcolm based his opinion on the work of Lucien Karchmar in *Draža Mihailović and the Rise of the Četnik Movement, 1941–1942* (New York: Garland, 1987), in which Karchmar claims the document is a fake. However, Jozo Tomašević—the most authoritative historian of World War II Yugoslavia—treats the document as authentic in *War and Revolution in Yugoslavia, 1941–1945: The Chetniks* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1975). Also, Norman Cigar, in his *Genocide in Bosnia*, and Sonja Biserko, in her *Yugoslavia's Implosion: The Fatal Attraction of Serbian Nationalism* (Belgrade: Norwegian Helsinki Committee, 2012), both analyzed Mihailović's directive without raising any doubts about its authenticity. The document is reproduced in *Dokumenti o izdajstvu Draže Mihailovića*, vol. 1 (Belgrade: State Commission for the Documentation of Crimes by the Occupiers and Their Collaborators, 1943). Given the systematic nature of crimes committed by Mihailović's forces against non-Serb civilians, and the role of Mihailović in these crimes, I give more prominence to those authors who do not doubt the authenticity of the directive.
27. Abazović, *Kadrovski rat za BiH*, 74.
28. The term "cleansing" used by Draža Mihailović is an obvious precursor to the euphemism "ethnic cleansing" used by Vojislav Šešelj and accepted by international observers during the aggression and genocide against Bosnia and Herzegovina. Both of these terms are nothing but a cloak for genocide, and they represent genocidal actions meant to exterminate one group of people.
29. Vladimir Dedijer and Antun Miletić, *Genocid nad Muslimanima: 1941–1945* (Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1990).
30. See: Šemso Tucaković, *Srpski zločini nad Bošnjacima-muslimanima: 1941–1945* (Sarajevo: El-Kalem and OKO, 1995), 13.
31. Mustafa Imamović, *Historija Bosnjaka* (Sarajevo: Preporod, 1998), 35.
32. Quoted in Robert J. Donia, *Islam under the Double Eagle: The Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina 1878–1914* (Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 1995), 3.
33. Malcolm, *Bosnia: A Short History*, 78.
34. Banac, *The National Question*, 371.
35. Banac quotes one Bosnian Serb source from 1926, who not only referred to Muslims as "Asians" but claimed their character was marked by "inertia, every kind of

indolence, mendacity and braggadocio, fatalism," and more. The writer also described Muslims as "parasitical" and "prone to business failures" and suggested "social de-Islamization," and if that failed, he said, "there remains only one solution; short, clear and inexorable. The singer of folk songs has foretold it and sung about it; he sings about it even today. We shall not repeat it here, because we all know it." It is Banac's conclusion that the reference is to violent Serbian epics. Čedomil Mitrinović, *Naši muslimani: Studija za orijentaciju pitanja bosansko-hercegovačkih muslimana* (Belgrade, 1926), 168–72, as quoted in: Banac, *The National Question*, 372.

36. This was attempted by Omar Pasha Latas, a mid-nineteenth-century ruler of Bosnia in the Ottoman Empire. See: Marko Atilla Hoare, *The History of Bosnia* (London: Saqi Books, 2007).
37. Hoare, *The History of Bosnia*, 59.
38. Malcolm, *Bosnia: A Short History*, 147. Kallay did find allies among moderate Muslims from Sarajevo whose leader was the prominent former mayor of Sarajevo, Mehmed-beg Kapetanović. Backed by Kallay, Kapetanović funded a journal entitled *Bošnjak* in 1891. The editorial line of the journal was to confront conservative attitudes in the Muslim clergy, who resented the idea of a common Bosnian nationhood, but it also "tried to fend off the attempts of both Croat and Serb nationalists to argue that the Muslims of Bosnia were 'really' Croats or Serbs." See ibid., 148.
39. Ibid., 149.
40. Moša Pijade, "Osnivački kongres KPBiH" (Sarajevo, 1950), 13, as quoted in: Duraković, *Prokletstvo Muslimana*, 225.
41. Dobrica Ćosić, together with the historian Jovan Marjanović, initiated a resolution at the meeting of the Central Committe of the Serbian Communist Party in June 1968 with the aim of preventing the recognition of the Muslim nation at the next census. But it was too late; Tito had already made the decision, and Ranković was not there to support the Serbian protest. Ćosić and Marjanović were excluded from the party because of this initiative. See: Ramet, *The Three Yugoslavias*, 287; also see: Branko Petranović, *Historija Jugoslavije 1918–1988*, vol. 3 (Belgrade: Nolit, 1988), 389.
42. Some Croatian public figures also questioned the justification for granting nationality to Muslims, arguing that Muslims are actually Croats. For more on this, see: Ramet, *The Three Yugoslavias*, 290.
43. Most of the Muslims working during that period on issues of Muslim culture, history, literature, and other social issues were under close police observation and were considered "ideologically suspicious." See: Duraković, *Prokletstvo Muslimana*, 231.
44. The verdict was strongly criticized by a number of human rights organizations that saw Izetbegović as a prisoner of conscience. The May following his trial, his sentence was reduced to twelve years; he served five and was released in 1988 as the Communist regime lost its hold on power.
45. Malcolm, *Bosnia: A Short History*, 208; Hoare, *The History of Bosnia*, 357; Alija Izetbegović, *Islam Between East and West* (Selangor, Malaysia: American Trust Publications, 1984).
46. Cigar, *Genocide in Bosnia*, 36.

47. In May 1951, Dwight Eisenhower, the then supreme Allied commander general and future U.S. president, argued that four Mediterranean states—Turkey, Greece, Yugoslavia, and Spain—should urgently be invited to join NATO because of their geostrategic importance. During the speech he called them "the soft belly of NATO." While Turkey and Greece accepted the offer and speedily joined NATO the next year, Tito declined the offer. Instead, he proposed trilateral mutual assistance among Yugoslavia, Greece, and Turkey, known as the Balkan Pact. This "Treaty of Friendship" was signed in February 1953, and a "Treaty of alliance, political cooperation and mutual assistance" in August 1954. This meant that Yugoslavia was actually indirectly linked to NATO's network of mutual security guarantees. See: Anton Bebler, *The Challenge of NATO Enlargement* (Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1999).
48. Josip Glaurdić, *The Hour of Europe: Western Powers and the Breakup of Yugoslavia* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), 13.
49. Noel Malcolm, *Kosovo: A Short History* (New York: New York University Press, 1998), 325.
50. Bennett, *Yugoslavia's Bloody Collapse*, 89.
51. Branka Magaš, *The Destruction of Yugoslavia: Tracking the Break-Up 1980–1992* (London: Verso, 1993), 7–8.
52. Dizdarević, *From the Death of Tito*, 83.
53. Ibid.
54. Bennett, *Yugoslavia's Bloody Collapse*, 93. For a discussion on the methods of Serbian propagandists to exaggerate statistics, see: Magaš, *The Destruction of Yugoslavia*, 62.
55. Ian Traynor, obituary of Ivan Stambolić, *Guardian*, April 1, 2003.
56. Ibid.
57. The TV Belgrade broadcast of these events, from April 25, 1987, is available on YouTube: http://www.youtube.com/watch?=__csVX8-Vg (accessed August 20, 2012). Milošević's speech begins at 0:47.
58. Laura Silber and Allan Little, *The Death of Yugoslavia* (London: Penguin Books/BBC Books, 1995), 36–38.
59. Dizdarević, *From the Death of Tito*, 188.
60. This issue is addressed in depth in chapter 3.
61. Bennett, *Yugoslavia's Bloody Collapse*, 104.
62. Ibid., 105.
63. Glaurdić, *The Hour of Europe*, 61; James Gow and Cathie Carmichael, *Slovenia and the Slovenes: A Small State and the New Europe* (London: C. Hurst, 2001), 96.
64. This right was introduced by the 1974 constitution but was not confirmed by any other republic before Slovenia did so in 1989.
65. See Glaurdić, *The Hour of Europe*, 60–61.
66. According to Borisav Jović, who served as a Serbian representative of the collective Yugoslav presidency, two days before the signing of the Brijuni Accord, General Kadijević agreed with him and Milošević to distribute army troops along the line of the new Serbian state in Croatian territory. Part of the plan to transform the Yugoslav Army into a Serbian force was to expel the Slovenian and Croatian officers. For more on this, see: Borisav Jović, *Poslednji Dani SFRJ: Izvodi iz dnevnika* (Belgrade: Politika, 1996), 349.

67. Jovan Rašković, the leader of the Serbian Democratic Party in Croatia, said in an open letter to Milošević in September 1990 that Milošević was the "physical protector" of Serbs in Croatia and Bosnia in "their common fight for a complete Serbian entity" (*Novi Sad Dnevnik*, September 1, 1990). In similar wording, Radovan Karadžić expressed the same view: "We are openly saying what could not even be whispered before: the Serbs in Bosnia and Herzegovina are investing all their hopes in their mother country, Serbia, and will never allow a state border to separate them from Serbia" (interview with Radovan Karadžić, *NIN* [*Nedeljne informativne novine*], November 9, 1990).
68. Prosecution's Second Pre-Trial Brief (Croatia and Bosnia Indictments), *Prosecutor v. Milosević*, No. IT-02-54-T (May 31, 2002), 8–9.
69. Ibid., 10–11.
70. Ali, "Separating History from Myth," 145.
71. Glaurdić, *The Hour of Europe*, 160.
72. See: Jović, *Poslednji Dani SFRJ*.
73. Garth S. Jowett and Victoria O'Donnell, *Propaganda and Persuasion* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1992), 7.
74. Jacques Ellul, *Propaganda: The Formation of Men's Attitudes* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965), 61.
75. This is a short summary borrowed from the longer version in de La Brosse's report. See: Renaud de La Brosse, "Political Propaganda and the Plan to Create a 'State for all Serbs': Consequences of Using the Media for Ultra-Nationalist Ends," Expert Report, *Prosecutor v. Milošević*, No. IT-02-54-T (February 4, 2003).
76. Silber and Little, *The Death of Yugoslavia*, 38.
77. Mark Thompson, *Forging War: The Media in Serbia, Croatia, and Bosnia-Hercegovina* (London: Article 19, 1994), 54.
78. See: Thomas A. Emmert, *Serbian Golgotha: Kosovo, 1389*, East European Monographs 278 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990), 82–121.
79. John Hutchinson, "Cultural Nationalism and Moral Regeneration," in *Nationalism*, ed. John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 123.
80. Vasa D. Mihailovich, "The Tradition of Kosovo in Serbian Literature," in *Kosovo: Legacy of a Medieval Battle*, Minnesota Mediterranean and East European Monographs 1, ed. Wayne S. Vuchinich and Thomas A. Emmert (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1991), 141.
81. For more detail on this, see: Miodrag Popović, *Vidovdan i časni krst* (Belgrade: Biblioteka XX vek, 2007).
82. Cigar, *Genocide in Bosnia*, 13.
83. See: Ralph Bogert, "Paradigm of Defeat or Victory? The Kosovo Myth versus the Kosovo Convenant in Fiction," in *Kosovo: Legacy of a Medieval Battle*, ed. Vuchinich and Thomas Emmert.
84. Branimir Azulović, *Heavenly Serbia: From Myth to Genocide* (New York: New York University Press, 1999), 11.
85. Michael E. Geisler, ed., *National Symbols, Fractured Identities: Contesting the National Narrative* (Lebanon, NH: Middlebury College Press, 2005), 50.

86. Florian Bieber, “Nationalist Mobilization and Stories of Serb Suffering,” *Rethinking History* 6, no. 1 (2002): 96.
87. Thomas Emmert, “The Kosovo Legacy,” in *Kosovo*, ed. William Dorich and Basil W. R. Jenkins (Alhambra, CA: Kosovo Charity Fund, 1992). Available online at: http://www.srpska-mreza.com/bookstore/kosovo/kosovo11.htm (accessed August 30, 2012).
88. Michael A. Sells, *The Bridge Betrayed* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 32.
89. As quoted in: Olga Zirojević, “Kosovo u kolektivnom pamćenju,” in *Srpska strana rata: Trauma i katarza u kolektivnom pamćenju*, ed. Nebojša Popov (Belgrade: Republika, 1996), 263.
90. Petar Petrovic Njegos, “The Mountain Wreath” (Vienna, 1847). Translated into English by Vasa D. Mihailovich. Available at http://www.rastko.rs/knjizevnost/njegos/njegos-mountain_wreath.html#assembly (accessed May 11, 2011).
91. Ibid.
92. Ivan Čolović, *The Politics of Symbol in Serbia* (London: Hurst, 2002), 83.
93. Ibid., 82.
94. Ibid., 83.
95. Ibid., 61.
96. Aleksandar Hemon, “Genocide’s Epic Hero,” *New York Times*, July 27, 2008.
97. Cigar, *Genocide in Bosnia*, 13.
98. The most authoritative and objective studies on the complicated networks and changing alliances of World War II–era Yugoslavia have been done by Jozo Tomasevich, published in two volumes: *War and Revolution in Yugoslavia, 1941–1945: The Chetniks* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1975) and *War and Revolution in Yugoslavia, 1941–1945: Occupation and Collaboration* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001).
99. Cigar, *Genocide in Bosnia*, 19.
100. Enver Redžić, *Bosnia and Herzegovina in the Second World War* (New York: Frank Cass, 2005), 19.
101. See: Seka Brljača, Muhidin Pelešić, and Husnija Kamberović, “Bosna i Hercegovina u toku Drugog svjetskog rata,” in Emir Imamović et al., *Bosna i Hercegovina od najstarijih vremena do kraja Drugog svjetskog rata* (Sarajevo: Bosanski kulturni centar, 1998), 349. For detailed accounts of different historical interpretations of World War II history in Bosnia and Herzegovina, see Redžić, *Bosnia and Herzegovina in the Second World War*, and Marko Attila Hoare, *Genocide and Resistance in Hitler’s Bosnia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).
102. Max Bergholz, “The Strange Silence: Explaining the Absence of Monuments for Muslim Civilians Killed in Bosnia during the Second World War,” *East European Politics and Societies* 24, no. 3 (2010): 408–34.
103. Cigar, *Genocide in Bosnia*, 24.
104. Following his publication of *Modern Jihad as War* (Belgrade: Nova knjiga, 1989), Jevtić was frequently interviewed by the media on the subject of Islamic fundamentalism. Another academic with a more respectable academic standing who also produced propaganda for Milošević was Darko Tanasković. Many journalists and authors

writing for the Serbian magazines *Duga* and *NIN* also specialized in this kind of hateful propaganda—such as Brana Crnčević, Dragoš Kalajić, and others.

105. Mirloljub Jevtić, "Šta se kuha u bosanskom muslimanskom loncu: Rezervisti Allahove Vojske" [What's Cooking in the Bosnian Muslim Pot? The Reservists of Allah's Army], *Duga*, December 9, 1989.
106. As quoted in: Cigar, *Genocide in Bosnia*, 25.
107. Sabrina P. Ramet, "Under the Holy Lime Tree: The Inculcation of Neurotic and Psychotic Syndromes as a Serbian Wartime Strategy, 1986–95," in *Serbia Since 1989: Politics and Society under Milošević and After*, ed. Sabrina P. Ramet and Vjeran Pavlaković (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2005), 128.
108. Ibid., 133.
109. Sabrina P. Ramet, "The Politics of the Serbian Orthodox Church," in *Serbia Since 1989*, ed. Ramet and Pavlaković, 255.
110. Rašković's interview with YUTEL was quoted by the independent Belgrade journal *Vreme* on January 27, 1992; and also in Kemal Kurspahić, *Prime Time Crime: Balkan Media in War and Peace* (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2003), 53.

CHAPTER 3. "JOINT CRIMINAL ENTERPRISE"

1. Kasim I. Begić, *Bosna i Hercegovina: od Vanceove misije do Daytonskog sporazuma, 1991–1996* (Sarajevo: Bosanska knjiga, 1997), 16–17.
2. Ibid., 20.
3. See, for example: "Assembly of the Serbian Democratic Party of Bosnia and Herzegovina, 12 July 1991," Exhibit P64.29.1, *Prosecutor v. Krajišnik*, No. IT-00-39, p. 11. In this stenogram of the SDS session held on St. Peter's Day, July 12, 1991, in Sarajevo, Karadžić is reported to have said: "Before the feast of St. Peter last year, when the Steering Committee was at work with the participation of over 2,000 people from Sarajevo and Bosnia and Herzegovina, it was prohibited to form parties whose name contained the ethnic element. At that time we did not know whether we would be arrested or allowed to proceed." Donia notes that the Croatian Democratic Party (HDZ) in Bosnia and Herzegovina was active in BiH shortly after it was formed in Croatia in late 1989, while the Muslim Party adopted a neutral name—the Party of Democratic Action—to avoid being labeled a national party at the time their organization was illegal. In other words, these political parties were formed before the decision of the Constitutional Court. See: Robert Donia, "Bosnian Krajina in the History of Bosnia and Herzegovina," Expert Report, *Prosecutor v. Brđanin*, No. IT-99-36 (January 11, 2002).
4. Kemal Kurspahić, *Prime Time Crime: Balkan Media in War and Peace* (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2003), 89.
5. The Agrokomerc affair involved many conspiracy rumors. According to the most prevalent, the scandal was aimed to discredit Hamdija Pozderac, who was the Bosnian vice president in the Yugoslav Presidency at the time. Pozderac was close to Fikret Abdić, the head of Agrokomerc. According to the rotation scheme of the Yugoslav Presidency, Pozderac was slated to become president in 1988. As the conspiracy theory

goes, "he was considered potentially too hard headed to give into pressure from Serbia to abolish the autonomy of Kosovo and Vojvodina and strengthen Belgrade-based central institutions." Ibid., 89–90.

6. Analysis in this and the previous paragraph relies on my own notes, journalistic coverage, and insight on that period.
7. "Serbs in Bosnia: An Interview with Radovan Karadžić," *NIN*, July 20, 1990.
8. For more on opposing factions within the Bosnian HDZ, see: Josip Glaurdić, *The Hour of Europe: Western Powers and the Breakup of Yugoslavia* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), 263–64.
9. *Oslobođenje*, January 31, 1991, p. 1.
10. *Oslobođenje*, June 28, 1991, p. 6.
11. Mirko Pejanović, *Bosansko pitanje i Srbi u Bosni i Herzegovini* (Sarajevo: Bosanska knjiga, 1999), 19.
12. Marko Attila Hoare, *The History of Bosnia: From the Middle Ages to the Present Day* (London: Saqi Books, 2007), 371.
13. Borisav Jović, *Posljednji dani SFRJ* (Kragujevac: Prizma, 1996), 420.
14. *Oslobođenje*, December 21, 1991, p. 3.
15. Prosecution's Submission Pursuant to Rule 65 *ter* (E)(i)–(iii) & Final Pre-Trial Brief, *Prosecutor v. Karadžić*, No. IT-95-5/18-PT (May 18, 2009), 7.
16. Momčilo Krajišnik was the president of the Parliament of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina at the time of this conversation. After Bosnian Serbs abandoned legal Bosnian institutions, he became president of the newly formed quasi-state institution, the Parliament of the Bosnian Serb Republic. He was tried and indicted by the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, and was sentenced to twenty years' imprisonment on March 17, 2009.
17. All Karadžić quotes are taken from: Prosecution's . . . Final Pre-Trial Brief, *Prosecutor v. Karadžić*, 10.
18. Hoare, *The History of Bosnia*, 362.
19. Prosecution's Second Pre-Trial Brief (Croatia and Bosnia Indictments), *Prosecutor v. Milošević*, No. IT-02-54-T (May 31, 2002), 15, para. 40.
20. It is difficult to explain negotiations between Tuđman and Milošević over the division of Bosnia, given that Serb and JNA forces were involved in armed aggression in Croatia through which they occupied 30 percent of Croatia, and given the fighting during the Bosnian War between Croat and Serb forces in Bosanska Posavina, where a majority Croat population lived. According to Bilandžić, who was interviewed by Croatian weekly *Nacional*, two members of the Serbian negotiation team, Kosta Mihajlović and Smilja Avramov, told him: "Our presidents agreed that the whole of Posavina belongs to Serbia." Bilandžić said he could not understand why Croatian troops were fighting in Posavina if it was already agreed upon with Milošević that it would be the war booty of Serbia. He asked Tuđman about this, and Bilandžić related that Tuđman told him it should not look as if "that territory was given up without a fight." See: Dušan Bilandžić, "Tuđman mi je rekao da moramo podijeliti Bosnu," *Nacional* (Zagreb), June 5, 2012, p. 31.
21. Ibid.

22. For testimony about negotiations with Milošević, see two books written by leaders of the Bosniak Muslim Organization: Muhamed Filipović, *Bio sam Alijin Diplomata* (Bihać: Delta, 2000); and Adil Zulfikarpašić, *Okovana Bosna: Razgovor* (Zurich: Bošnjački Institut, 1995). For additional interpretations of the deal made between Milošević and the Bosniak Muslim Organization, and the consequences it held for Croatia, see: Glaurdić, *The Hour of Europe*, 152–53.
23. Rabia Ali, "Separating History from Myth: An Interview with Ivo Banac," in *Why Bosnia?* ed. Rabia Ali and Lawrence Lifschultz (Stony Creek, CT: Pamphleteer's Press, 1993), 147.
24. In March 1994, the Washington Agreement was signed by Bosnia and Herzegovina and Bosnian Croats, who were represented by the Republic of Croatia. The territories held by Croat forces and Bosnian government forces were divided into ten cantons, and the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina was established.
25. For more on this meeting, see: Donia, "Bosnian Krajina in the History of Bosnia," 60–61.
26. Official Gazette of the Serb People in BIH, "Decision on the Territory of Municipalities, Local Communities and Settlements in BIH Considered an Integral Part of the Territory of the Federal State of Yugoslavia," January 15, 1992, ICTY Archives.
27. Central Committee of the SDS in BiH, "Instructions on the Organization and Activities of Serb Bodies in BiH in Extraordinary Circumstances," December 19, 1991, ICTY Archives.
28. Ibid.
29. Radovan Karadžić, "To All Municipal and Regional Committees of the SDS in BiH," August 15, 1991, ICTY Archives.
30. Radovan Karadžić, "To All Municipal and Regional Committees of the SDS in BiH—Guidelines for Work," August 15, 1991, ICTY Archives.
31. The Secretariat of municipal SDS committees consisted of the president, the vice president, and a secretary.
32. Dorothea Hanson, "Bosnian Serb Crisis Staffs," Expert Report, Exhibit P528, *Prosecutor v. Krajišnik*, No. IT-00-39 (July 30, 2002), 6.
33. Ibid., 8.
34. Ibid. (See entire document.)
35. Ibid., 9.
36. Ibid., 10.
37. Ibid., 12–13.
38. Official Gazette of the Serb People in BiH, "Decision on Establishing of Republic of Serb Bosnia and Herzegovina," January 15, 1992, ICTY Archives.
39. Official Gazette of the Serb People in BiH, "Decree on Promulgation of the Law on Internal Affairs"; "Decree on Promulgation of the Law on Public Campaign"; "Decree on Promulgation of the Law on National Defense," ICTY Archives.
40. Official Gazette of the Serb People in BiH, "Law on National Defense," ICTY Archives.
41. Testimony of Dr. James Gow, *Prosecutor v. Orić*, No. IT-03-68, Transcript (November 23, 2004), 1871.

42. *Vreme*, September 23, 1991, 7 and 9. For more details about the RAM plan and its implementation, see: Smail Čekić, *Agresija na Republiku Bosnu i Hercegovinu* (Sarajevo: Institute for Research of Crimes against Humanity and International Law, 2004), 325–477.
43. For discussion of RAM in the Milošević trial, see: *Prosecutor v. Milošević*, No. IT-02-54-T, Transcript (November 22, 2002).
44. Milan Babić was the president of the self-proclaimed Republika Srpska Krajina from 1991 to 1995, which aimed to secede from Croatia and join Serbia proper. Babić was indicted for war crimes, and was the first ICTY indictee to admit guilt. He made a plea bargain with the prosecutor and agreed to testify against Slobodan Milošević; he was sentenced to thirteen years. In an interview with me, the chief prosecutor Sir Geoffrey Nice said that Babić's testimony was the most important testimony in the Milošević case. Nice spent many hours in conversations with Babić, and his assessment was that Babić's repentance was genuine. On March 6, 2006, Milan Babić committed suicide in his cell.
45. Testimony of Milan Babić, *Prosecutor v. Milošević*, No. IT-02-54, Transcript (November 19, 2002), 13054–56 and 13808–13.
46. "Intercept of conversation between Radovan Karadžić and Slobodan Milošević," CD-1-28-8/01/212, December 30, 1991, Exhibit P613.151a, *Prosecutor v. Milošević*, No. IT-02-54 (December 4, 2003).
47. For more on this, see: Hoare, *The History of Bosnia*, 363; and Laura Silber and Allan Little, *The Death of Yugoslavia* (London: Penguin Books/BBC Books, 1996), 205–6.
48. See: Silber and Little, *The Death of Yugoslavia*, 229; and James William Gow, *The Serbian Project and Its Adversaries: A Strategy of War Crime* (London: Hurst, 2003), 184–85.
49. Gow, *The Serbian Project*, 184.
50. Ibid., 174–75.
51. Donia, "Bosnian Krajina in the History of Bosnia," 72.
52. "Case Concerning Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide," Judgment, *Bosnia and Herzegovina v. Serbia* (February 26, 2007), para. 235. The judgment is available online at: http://www.icj-cij.org/docket/files/91/13685.pdf (accessed August 30, 2012).
53. Ibid., para. 422.
54. Zoran Udovičić, "Media Plan Research: 'Hate Speech' Losing Its Colors," *AIM* (February 13, 1996), quoted in: Kurspahić, *Prime Time Crime*, 101.
55. Quoted in: Kurspahić, *Prime Time Crime*, 101–2.
56. Robert J. Donia, "Republika Srpska Assembly, 1992–1995: Highlights and Excerpts," Report, Exhibit P537.2a, *Prosecutor v. Milošević*, No. IT-02-54 (July 29, 2003), 3–4.
57. Ibid., 5–6.
58. Edina Bećirević, "Bosnia's 'Accidental Genocide,'" *IWPR Tribunal Update*, February 29, 2006.
59. Donia, "Republika Srpska Assembly, 1992–1995," 6.
60. Ibid., 13.
61. Ibid., 16.

62. Ibid., 20.
63. Ibid., 42.
64. Ibid., 80.
65. Ibid., 83.
66. Radovan Karadžić, “Plebiscite of the Serb People” (translation), November 1991, Exhibit D512, *Prosecutor v. Orić*, No. IT-03-68. According to a note on this translation, the original tape of the speech is held at the National Commission for Investigating War Crimes, Sarajevo.
67. Ibid., 5–6.
68. Ibid., 9–10.
69. Ibid., 11.
70. *Armed Combat Strategy* (Belgrade, 1983), 112–13 and 120–21. For details on the TO and JNA, and their roles in the aggression against BiH, see Čekić, *Agresija na Republiku Bosnu i Hercegovinu*, 28–29.
71. Testimony of Dr. James Gow. *Prosecutor v. Orić* (November 22, 2004), 1769.
72. Čekić, *Agresija na Republiku Bosnu i Hercegovinu*, 35.
73. For a detailed analysis and history of the JNA, see: James William Gow, *Legitimacy and the Military: The Yugoslav Crisis* (London: Pinter, 1992); also see: Gow, *The Serbian Project*.
74. Dušan Bilandžić, *Jugoslavija poslije Tita 1980–1985* (Zagreb: Globus, 1986), 79.
75. Čekić, *Agresija na Republiku Bosnu i Herzegovinu*, 37.
76. For more on the JNA, see ibid., 37–39. Also see: Enver Hadžihasanović, Kadir Jusić, and Munib Milišić, “Drinski korpus (1992–1995)—Vojna ekspertiza,” July 2000, Archives of the Army of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. From page 42: “As of January 1989 the JNA was strategically restructured and transformed into an Army consisting of four military districts (Zagreb, Belgrade, Skopje and Split).”
77. Davor Marijan, “ ‘Unity’—the JNA’s Last Organizational Framework,” *Polemos* 6, nos. 11–12 (April 2003): 11. Available in B/S/C at: http://www.scribd.com/doc/97963351/Davor-Marijan-Jedinstvo-Poslednji-Ustroj-JNA.
78. Ibid.
79. For military, police, and special forces charged with mass murder, see: Michael Thad Allen, *The Business of Genocide: The SS, Slave Labor and the Concentration Camps* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002).
80. Susan L. Woodward, *Balkan Tragedy* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1995), 49.
81. For the human resources policies of the JNA and the Serbian government, see these detailed and documented studies: Mirsad Abazović, *Kadrovski rat za BiH: 1945–1991* (Sarajevo: Savez logoraša Bosne i Hercegovine CID, 1999); and “Analiza uzroka transformacije JNA od antifašističke do velikosrpske vojske,” in Čekić, *Agresija na Republiku Bosnu i Hercegovinu*.
82. See: Misha Glenny, *The Fall of Yugoslavia* (London: Penguin Books, 1992), 134.
83. “Report on Evaluation of Conditions in Bosnia and Herzegovina—Area of 2nd Military Unit,” March 1992, Classified Record, Copy No. 2, Archives of the Army of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The report was signed by Colonel General Milutin Kukanjac, the commander.

84. See chapter 5, the Bratunac case study.
85. General Ferenc Vegh, "Expert Report of General Vegh," Exhibit P644, *Prosecutor v. Milošević,* No. IT-02-54 (December 23, 2003), 29.
86. Ibid., 31.
87. Testimony of General Rupert Smith, *Prosecutor v. Milošević,* No. IT-02-54, Transcript (October 9, 2003), 27368.
88. Dick Geary, *Hitler and Nazism* (London: Routledge, 1993). Writing about the role of paramilitary formations under Hitler's regime, Geary analyzes how Hitler, with the assistance of such troops (SS, SA, and Stahlhelm men), suspended human rights and freedoms, neutralized the Nazis' political opponents, and used them for the exterminations of Jews.
89. Decision on Motion for Judgment of Acquittal, *Prosecutor v. Milošević,* No. IT-02-54 (June 16, 2004).
90. Prosecutor's Response to Amici Curiae Motion for Judgment of Acquittal, *Prosecutor v. Milošević,* No. IT-02-54 (May 3, 2004), 130.
91. Geoffrey Nice, interview with author, Sarajevo, June 22, 2007.
92. Testimony of General Rupert Smith, *Prosecutor v. Milošević* (October 9, 2003).
93. Mlađan Dinkić, *The Economics of Destruction: The Great Robbery of the People* (Belgrade: Stubovi Kulture, 1997), 144–46.
94. Morten Torkildsen, "Second Expert Report of Morten Torkildsen," Exhibit P00310, *Prosecutor v. Perišić,* No. IT-04-81 (October 10, 2008), 30.
95. Quoted in: Morten Torkildsen, "Expert Report of Morten Torkildsen," *Prosecutor v. Milošević,* No. IT-02-54 (May 29, 2002), 19.
96. See: "Milošević Argues for Acceptance of Bosnian Peace Plan: 'Serbia Needs Peace,'" *Tanjug,* May 11, 1993, Exhibit P427.56a, *Prosecutor v. Milošević,* No. IT-02-54.
97. "Notes from a Meeting Held in Dobanovci (Serbia) between Slobodan Milošević and the Bosnian Serb Leadership," Exhibit P469.20a, *Prosecutor v. Milošević,* No. IT-02-54. The August 25 meeting was originally Tab 34 in Exhibit 469, but was joined with Tab 20 (record of the August 29 meeting) on June 18, 2003.
98. Ibid., 4.
99. Ibid., 5.
100. Ibid., 7.
101. Ibid., 10.
102. Ibid.
103. Testimony of James Gow, *Prosecutor v. Orić,* No. IT-03-68, Transcript (November 24, 2004), 1991.

CHAPTER 4. GENOCIDE IN EASTERN BOSNIA

1. Ivan Čolović, *The Politics of Symbol in Serbia: Essays in Political Anthropology* (London: Hurst, 2002), 33–34.
2. Ibid., 34.
3. Ibid.
4. Robert J. Donia, "Republika Srpska Assembly, 1992–1995: Highlights and Excerpts," Report, Exhibit P537.2a, *Prosecutor v. Milošević,* No. IT-02-54 (July 29, 2003), 3–4.

5. Branka Magaš, "The Destruction of Bosnia-Herzegovina" in *Why Bosnia?* ed. Rabia Ali and Lawrence Lifschultz (Stony Creek, CT: Pamphleteer's Press, 1993), 251.
6. Gow quoted in: Noel Malcolm, *Bosnia: A Short History* (New York: New York University Press, 1994), 238.
7. Central Committee of the SDS in BiH, "Instructions on the Organization and Activities of Serb Bodies in BiH in Extraordinary Circumstances," December 19, 1991, ICTY Archives.
8. According to the 1991 census, Zvornik had: 48,108 Muslims, 30,863 Serbs, 122 Croats, 1,248 Yugoslavs, and 960 others; Vlasenica had: 18,727 Muslims, 14,359 Serbs, 39 Croats, 340 Yugoslavs, and 477 others; Bratunac had: 21,535 Muslims, 11, 475 Serbs, 40 Croats, 233 Yugoslavs, and 346 others; Rogatica had: 13,209 Muslims, 8,391 Serbs, 19 Croats, 186 Yugoslavs, and 173 others; Foča had 20,790 Muslims, 18,315 Serbs, 94 Croats, 463 Yugoslavs, and 851 others; Višegrad had 13,471 Muslims, 6,743 Serbs, 32 Croats, 319 Yugoslavs, 634 others; and Srebrenica had 27,572 Muslims, 8,315 Serbs, 38 Croats, 380 Yugoslavs, and 361 others. Source: Agencija za statistiku Bosne i Hercegovine, *Demografija: Tematski bilten—02/2007* (Sarajevo, 2007).
9. Prosecution's Submission Pursuant to Rule 65 *ter* (E)(i)-(iii) & Final Pre-Trial Brief, *Prosecutor v. Karadžić*, No. IT-95–5/18-PT (May 18, 2009), 12.
10. Donia, "Republika Srpska Assembly, 1992–1995," 5–6.
11. Ian Traynor, "Radovan Karadžić Delivers 'Dissident' View of Bosnian War," *Guardian*, March 1, 2010.
12. Quotes in this paragraph from: Prosecution's . . . Final Pre-Trial Brief, *Prosecutor v. Karadžić*, 44–47.
13. Sidik Ademović, interview with author, Sarajevo, October 15, 2006.
14. Ibid.
15. Enver Hadžihasanović, Kadir Jusić, and Munib Milišić, *Drinski korpus (1992–1995)* (Sarajevo, July 2000), 64, FBiH military archive.
16. Samantha Power, A *Problem from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide* (New York: Basic Books, 2002).
17. Ibid., 266.
18. Ibid.
19. For a review of domestic and foreign authors who have documented genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina, see chapter 1.
20. For a detailed analysis of strategic goals, see chapter 3.
21. Andras Riedlmayer, "Destruction of Cultural Heritage in Bosnia-Herzegovina, 1992–1996: A Post-war Survey of Selected Municipalities," Expert Report, Exhibit P486, *Prosecutor v. Milošević*, No. IT-02-54 (July 8, 2003), 11.
22. Ibid., 14.
23. Ibid., 11.
24. Irving Louis Horowitz, *Taking Lives: Genocide and State Power* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 1997), 21.
25. See: Dick Geary, *Hitler and Nazism* (London: Routledge, 1993).
26. Bernard Bruneteau, *Stoljeće genocida* (Zagreb: Politička kultura, 2005), 42. On the causes of genocide against Armenians, see: Benjamin A. Valentino, *Final Solutions:*

Mass Killing and Genocide in the 20th Century (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004), 152–96.

27. *Interhamwe* means "those that stick together."
28. Jerry Robert Kajuga, head of these special units, explained the relationship between the Interhamwe and the Rwandan government in: Alison Desforges, *Leave None to Tell the Story: Genocide in Rwanda* (New York: Human Rights Watch, 1999), 180. Available at http://www.hrw.org/reports/1999/rwanda, see: "Politicians and Militia" (accessed April 5, 2007).
29. For economic and other motives for genocide, see: Ton Zwaan, "On the Aetiology and Genesis of Genocides and Other Mass Crimes Targeting Specific Groups," Expert Report, Exhibit P639, *Prosecutor v. Milošević*, No. IT-02-54 (January 20, 2004), 5.
30. Raul Hilberg, *La destruction des Juifs d'Europe* (Paris: Fayard, 1988), cited in Bruneteau, *Stoljeće genocida*, 79.
31. On the suffering of Bosniaks in Zvornik and other towns and villages in eastern Bosnia in 1992 and 1993, see: Muhidin Džanko, "Eastern Bosnia: Continuity of Serb Crimes," in *Almanac of Essays: The Destruction of Bosnian Muslim Identity* (Zenica: Dom štampe, 1994).
32. See: Đoko Mazalić, "Zvornik, stari grad na Drini," *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja* 11 (1956): 269; and Mehmed Hudović, *Zvornik: Slike i bilješke iz prošlosti* (Sarajevo: Udruženje građana opštine Zvornik, 2000), 22.
33. Hudović, *Zvornik*, 38.
34. Confirmation that crimes committed in Zvornik between 1941 and 1943 were committed by Ustasha and Chetnik appears in a document entitled "Chetnik and Ustasha Crimes in the Territory of Birač: A Report by the County Body of the State Commission on Birač and Zvornik," No. 14/45 (June 15, 1945). This document can be found in Smail Čekić, *Genocid nad Bošnjacima u Drugom svjetskom ratu* (Sarajevo: Udruženje Muslimana za antigenocidne aktivnosti, 1996), 460–62.
35. L. G., interview with author, Sarajevo, March 20, 2007.
36. Census database, Federal Institute for Statistics, Sarajevo.
37. See: Raul Hilberg, *Perpetrators, Victims, Bystanders* (New York: Perennial, 1993); V. J. Barnett, *Bystanders* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2000); and E. Fogelman, *Conscience and Courage* (New York: Random/Anchor, 1994).
38. For a detailed description of the torture and execution of Bosniaks by their Serb neighbors and Serb special forces, see the testimonies and statements made by refugees, detainees, and raped women from the municipalities of Zvornik, Vlasenica, Srebrenica, and Bratunac (forty-six in total) found in: "The Commission on Gathering Facts on War Crimes, Tuzla," Tuzla Canton archive. These original testimonies are authenticated with signatures.
39. Vahid Karavelić, *Agresija na Bosnu i Hercegovinu, sjeveroistočna Bosna 1991–1992* (Sarajevo: Institute for Research of Crimes against Humanity and International Law, 2003), 168.
40. For more, see the testimony and analysis of Robert Donia that I include in chapter 3.
41. Mazalić, *Zvornik*, 269; and Hudović, *Zvornik*, 104.
42. Karavelić, *Agresija na Bosnu i Hercegovinu*, 170.

43. Stefan Muller, “Aggression and Mass Expulsion in Zvornik,” in *Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina 1991–1995* (Sarajevo: Institute for Research of Crimes against Humanity and International Law, 1995), 132–36.
44. Karavelić, *Agresija na Bosnu i Hercegovinu*, 171.
45. Muller, “Aggression and Mass Expulsion,” 132–36.
46. *Jedinice (The Units)*, film directed by Filip Švarm (Serbia: TV B92, 2006). Transcripts of interviews used in this documentary are available at: http://www.b92.net/specijal/jedinica/ (accessed July 25, 2007).
47. Prosecution’s Submission Pursuant to Rule 65 *ter* (E)(i)–(iii) & Final Pre-Trial Brief, *Prosecutor v. Karadžić*, No. IT-95-5/18-PT (May 18, 2009), 23.
48. A more detailed presentation of this project can be found in Muller, “Aggression and Mass Expulsion.”
49. “Decision on the Establishment of the Serb Municipality of Zvornik,” December 27, 1991, Institute for Research of Crimes against Humanity and International Law Archives, Sarajevo.
50. “Decision on the Proclamation of the Serb Municipality of Zvornik,” issued by President of the Assembly of the Serb Municipality of Zvornik Jovo Mijatović, No. 01-023-237/92, March 15, 1992.
51. “Decision on Conjoining the Serb Municipality of Zvornik with the Regions of Majevica-Semberija and Birač,” issued by President of the Assembly of the Serb Municipality of Zvornik Jovo Mijatović, No. 01-023-247/92.
52. “Decision on Proclaiming a State of War in the Serb Municipality of Zvornik,” No. 01-2/92, April 6, 1992.
53. Muller, “Aggression and Mass Expulsion.”
54. Hadžihasanović, Jusić, and Milišić, *Drinski korpus*, 73.
55. Hazim Karić, interview with author, Tuzla, May 28, 2007.
56. Almasa Hadžić, interview with author, Tuzla, May 28, 2007.
57. United Nations Economic and Social Council, “Report on the Situation of Human Rights in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia Submitted by Mr. Tadeusz Mazowiecki, Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights, Pursuant to Commission Resolution 1992/S-1/1 of 14 August 1992,” E/CN.4/1993/50 (February 10, 1993), 9.
58. “Decision on the Restriction of Access to Commodity Reserves,” No. 01-3/92, April 7, 1992, ICTY Archives.
59. “Decision on the Establishment of a Special Unit of the Territorial Defense,” issued by Interim Government President Branko Grujić, April 18, 1992, ICTY Archives.
60. “Decision on the Establishment of the Command of the Territorial Defense of the Serb Municipality of Zvornik,” issued by Interim Government President Branko Grujić, No. 01-13/92, April 19, 1992, ICTY Archives.
61. “Conclusion on the Postponement of Implementation of the Decision on the Establishment of Special Forces of the Territorial Defense, Serb Autonomous Region of Semberija and Majevica, Serb Municipality of Zvornik,” issued by Interim Government President Branko Grujić, No. 01-023-14/92, ICTY Archives.
62. Brunetau, *Stoljeće genocida*, 78.

63. "Decision on the Termination of Contracts, the Serb Municipality of Zvornik," issued by Interim Government President Branko Grujić, No. 01-20/92, ICTY Archives.
64. Serb Municipality of Zvornik Assembly, "Decision on the Prohibition of the Traffic of Real Estate," issued by the President of the Assembly of the Serb Municipality of Zvornik Jovo Mijatović, No. 01-023-244/92, March 15, 1992, ICTY Archives.
65. Ibid.
66. "Decision of May 1_ (number unclear), the Serb Municipality of Zvornik," issued by Interim Government President Branko Grujić, ICTY Archives. This decision does not explicitly mention Bosniaks, but says that property owned by the state will be confiscated from all those who do not make use of it by May 15. It is clear that this pertains to the expelled Bosniaks, who were unable to make use of their property. This decision also allows confiscated property to be allocated to those who are able to meet that deadline.
67. "Decision on the Establishment of an Agency for the Exchange of Real Estate, Serb Autonomous Region of Semberija and Majevica, The Serb Municipality of Zvornik," issued by Interim Government President Branko Grujić, No. 01-023-16/92, May 11, 1992, ICTY Archives.
68. "Decision on Assuming Ownership of Deserted Housing and Business Facilities in the Serb Municipality of Zvornik," No. 01-023-27/92, May 16, 1992, ICTY Archives.
69. Muller, "Aggression and Mass Expulsion."
70. "Conclusion on the Allocation of Building Material to the Serbian Orthodox Church in Rodevic Municipality," issued by Executive Board President Radoslav Perić, No. 01-023-344/92, October 3, 1992, ICTY Archives.
71. Muller, "Aggression and Mass Expulsion," 135.
72. The indictment is available in English at: http://www.asser.nl/upload/documents/DomCLIC/Docs/NLP/Serbia/Zvornik1_Indictment_12-8-2005.pdf (accessed August 30, 2012).
73. Testimony of Fadil Banjanović Bracika, *Prosecutor v. Milošević*, No. IT-02-54 (May 19, 2003).
74. For more information on the use of children as soldiers, see: "Child Soldiers: From Cradle to War," Amnesty International USA, http://www.amnestyusa.org/our-work/issues/children-s-rights/child-soldiers?id=1051047 (accessed November 6, 2011).
75. See the case against Dragan Nikolić: *Prosecutor v. Nikolić*, No. IT-94-2.
76. See: Document AIIZ, No. 2-2809, statement by the Commander of the 216th Mountain Brigade, Lieutenant-Colonel Asim Džambasović, in which he tells about their mobilization and of obvious cooperation between JNA and SDS leaders. He says: "The Han Pijesak-Vlasenica-Zvornik route did not have to be overseen, because the members of the 3rd Mountain Battalion had already been dislocated to the region of Milići."
77. Izet Redžić, interview with author, Tuzla, July 17, 2006.
78. "Protocol of the Agreement Between Representatives of Serbs and Muslims, Appointed by Representatives of Parliamentary Parties and the Council for International Cooperation, on the Territorial Border of the Municipality of Vlasenica and the Constituting of New Municipalities," April 11, 1992, ICTY Archives.
79. Redžić, interview.

80. Ibid.
81. Ibid.
82. First Amended Indictment, *Prosecutor v. Nikolić*, No. IT-94-22 (February 12, 1999).
83. Ibid.
84. M. Z., interview with author, Tuzla, December 13, 2006.
85. Mehmed Kulo, interview with author, Tuzla, March 2, 2007; Munib Gabeljić, interview with author, Sarajevo, May 10, 2007.
86. Nermina Mahmutbegović, "Vlasenica," in *Zločinci i žrtve*, compiled by the State Commission for Gathering Facts on War Crimes (Živinice Municipal Commission, 1995), 54.
87. Ibid.
88. Ibid.; see statement of N. N., made on March 10, 1993.
89. The first documentation of the exhumation site in Zaklopača was contained in a report of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, Tuzla Criminal Technique Department. Report No. 09-01/2-8-230-275/98, July 1, 1998, included photographic documentation of the site.
90. First Amended Indictment, *Prosecutor v. Nikolić*.
91. "SV Brigade Command 'Birač': Guarding of Prisoners," order signed by Major Svetozar Andrić, Exhibit D731, *Prosecutor v. Orić* (May 31, 1992). My emphasis.
92. Statement by undisclosed woman, given on March 2, 1993. The original statement, with an authorizing signature, can be found in the archives of the Commission for Gathering Facts on War Crimes, Tuzla.
93. Judgment, *Prosecutor v. Nikolić*, No. IT-94-2 (December 18, 2003), paras. 189–92.
94. Ibid., para. 192.
95. Redžić, interview.
96. Roger Cohen, interview by Vlado Azinović, *Dani*, May 12, 2000; for this text in English, see: "How Jenki Was Uncovered," *Bosnia Report* 19/20, October–December 2000, http://www.bosnia.org.uk/bosrep/report_format.cfm?articleid=710&reportid=146 (accessed November 7, 2011).
97. All biographic information on Deronjić presented in this discussion was taken from an interview with V. Š.—an inhabitant of his town—who researched Deronjić's role in the preparation for genocide against Bosniaks at the Institute for Research of Crimes against Humanity and International Law. V. Š., interview with author, Tuzla, October 20, 2006. All biographical information was reconfirmed in the indictment against Deronjić and the text of the judgment in his case. See the case against Deronjić: *Prosecutor v. Deronjić*, No. IT-02-61.
98. Second Amended Indictment, *Prosecutor v. Deronjić*, No. IT-02-61 (September 29, 2003).
99. The first was the Serb Population Crisis Staff, established after a meeting held on October 18, 1991, which operated until at least December 19, 1991. The second was the SDS Crisis Staff, established after a meeting held on December 19, 1991, which operated until the end of April 1992, when the Crisis Staff of the municipality of Bratunac was established—it took on the competencies of the Municipal Executive Board and Municipal Assembly. It operated until it was transformed into the Wartime Committee,

formed by the Presidency of the Serb Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina in June 1992. See: Judgment, *Prosecutor v. Deronjić*, No. IT-02-61 (March 30, 2004).

100. Second Amended Indictment, *Prosecutor v. Deronjić.*
101. Ibid., para. 17.
102. Ademović, interview.
103. "Belgrade's Intelligence Aggression against BiH," *Dnevni Avaz,* March 26–27, 1999.
104. For a Serbian nationalistic account of events in Eastern Bosnia in 1992 and 1993, see: Boro Miljanović, *Krvavi Božić u selu Kravice* (Belgrade: Magenta, 2000), 38–40.
105. Nijaz Mašić, *Srebrenica: Agresija, otpor, izdaja, genocid* (Tuzla: Municipality of Srebrenica, 1999), 53.
106. Judgment, *Prosecutor v. Deronjić.*
107. Kertes was a long-time official of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and a representative in the Serbian Assembly. He also worked on arming the Serbs of Bosnia and Herzegovina. On Kertes's role, see: Smail Čekić, *Agresija na Republiku Bosnu i Hercegovinu* (Sarajevo: Institute for Research of Crimes against Humanity and International Law, 2004), 403 and 493.
108. Testimony of Miroslav Deronjić, *Prosecutor v. Deronjić,* No. IT-02-61, Transcript (January 27, 2004), 121.
109. Ibid., 123.
110. Decision on Motion for Judgment of Aquittal, *Prosecutor v. Milošević,* No. IT-02-54 (June 16, 2004), para. 306.
111. Testimony of Miroslav Deronjić, *Prosecutor v. Deronjić* (January 27, 2004), 134.
112. Ibid., 137.
113. Second Amended Indictment, *Prosecutor v. Deronjić,* paras. 18–20.
114. Factual Basis, *Prosecutor v. Deronjić,* No. IT-02-61 (September 30, 2003), para. 15. These facts were also provided by Sidik Ademović in the interview cited above. Ademović was employed at SJB Srebrenica (Public Security Service Srebrenica). He was asked to participate in ultimatum-driven negotiations at the Fontana Hotel in Bratunac. He said the atmosphere during negotiations had been threatening and that there had been coordination between special forces from Serbia, the JNA, and local Serb forces: "It was clear they were under joint command and they had the same goals."
115. Sentencing Judgment, *Prosecutor v. Deronjić,* No. IT-02-61 (March 30, 2004), paras. 72–73.
116. Ibid.
117. Mevzet Đozo, interview with author, Sarajevo, May 10, 2007.
118. Rifat Begić, interview with author, Sarajevo, May 30, 2007.
119. Ibid. Begić, who returned to Bratunac, has daily encounters with the Bratunac Serbs who tortured Bosniaks in the Vuk Karadžić school. For a survey of testimonies on the torture Bosniaks were subjected to in Bratunac and its surroundings, see: Sejo Omeragić, *Satanski sinovi* (Sarajevo: Ljiljan, 1994).
120. The team consisted of C. N. and two Dutch journalists, Bart Rijs and photojournalist Kadir van Luisien. C. N., interview with author, Sarajevo, August 13, 2006; Bart Rijs, interview with author, Amsterdam, September 1, 2006; Kadir van Luisien, interview with author, Amsterdam, September 1, 2006.

121. Begić, interview.
122. Najdan Mlađenović, a member of the TO, was with this group, as well as the following policemen from Bratunac: Milutin Milošević, chief of the Bratunac police force, Miladin Jokić, Vidoje Radović, Dragan Ilić, Dragan Vasiljević, Sredoje Stević, Vuković, and Tešić. Deronjić confirmed this in his confession. For more precise information, see: Second Amended Indictment, *Prosecutor v. Deronjić.*
123. Second Amended Indictment, *Prosecutor v. Deronjić.*
124. S.G., interview with author, Tuzla, July 14, 2006. S.G., a villager from Glogova, escaped through the window of his house and survived the May 9, 1992, massacre.
125. Factual Basis, *Prosecutor v. Deronjić*, para. 25.
126. Ibid., para. 29.
127. Nijaz Mašić, interview with author, Sarajevo, July 1, 2006.
128. Sentencing Judgment, *Prosecutor v. Deronjić*, para. 87.
129. S.G., interview.
130. Factual Basis, *Prosecutor v. Deronjić*, paras. 35, 41, and 44. In a continuation of the hearing on sentencing, Deronjić changed his statement, claiming the mosque was destroyed by "volunteers" during the night, after he had left Glogova. For more details, see: Sentencing Judgment, *Prosecutor v. Deronjić.*
131. Factual Basis, *Prosecutor v. Deronjić*, para. 46.
132. Ibid., para. 47.
133. Information on this exhumation, along with photographs, available at: http://www.genocid.org. For the Suha albums, see: http://www.genocid.org/gallery.php?album=15 and http://www.genocid.org/gallery.php?album=8 (accessed November 9, 2011).
134. Begić, interview; Edina Karić, interview with author, September 21, 2006. According to Karić, who spent May to June in the Sase camp, some people from Suha were in the same camp.
135. Deronjić was charged only with the crime in the village of Glogova, committed on May 9, 1992. Prosecutors in The Hague ignored the fact that on July 11, 1995, when genocide was being committed in Srebrenica, Deronjić had been appointed the civil commissar for the municipality of Srebrenica. Further, since he was a member of the Main Board of the SDS and thereby a member of the "joint criminal enterprise," Deronjić was responsible not only for the genocide in Srebrenica but for the genocide committed in the whole of eastern Bosnia. The opinion of German judge Schomburg, who presided over the trial chamber in the case against Deronjić, reveals more about this considerable prosecutorial mishandling. Judge Schomburg protested against the settlement made by the prosecution with Deronjić. He saw it as a basic violation of the principles of justice. See: Dissenting Opinion of Judge Schomburg, Sentencing Judgment, *Prosecutor v. Deronjić*, 83–90.
136. See: Ana Uzelac, "Judge Angered at Deronjić Prison Term," IWPR *Tribunal Update*, no. 351 (April 5, 2004).
137. Dissenting Opinion of Judge Schomburg, Sentencing Judgment, *Prosecutor v. Deronjić*, 83.
138. Ibid., 85.
139. Uzelac, "Judge Angered."

140. The three steps in the process of restorative justice are explained in detail by Stephen P. Garvey in: "Restorative Justice, Punishment and Atonement," *Utah Law Review* 303 (2003): 304–17.
141. For more about the conflict between settlements made in The Hague and the concept of restorative justice, see: Edina Bećirević, "Pogodbe Haškog tužilaštva sa optuženim ratnim zločincima: restorativna pravda ili samo trgovina?" *Kriminalističke teme*, nos. 1–2 (2004).
142. For a review of literature on the dangers of the repetition of genocide, see chapter 1.
143. For a theoretical explanation of the term "saviors," see chapter 5.
144. Faruk Kozić, "Rogatica: Zločini i uništavanje kulturne baštine," in *Razaranje Identiteta Bosanskih Muslimana* (Zenica: KDM Preporod, 1993), 229.
145. Ibid.
146. Muharem Omerdić, *Prilozi izučavanju genocida nad Bošnjacima (1992–1995)* (Sarajevo: El-Kalem, 1999).
147. Nusret E. Agić, *Živi štitovi* (Sarajevo: Hod, 1995), 39.
148. Semso Tucaković, *Srpski zločini nad Bošnjacima: Muslimanima 1941–1945* (Sarajevo: El-Kalem and OKO, 1995), 38.
149. Ibid.
150. Rogatica established the Serb Assembly on December 26, 1991, "on the instructions of the SDS Main Board." See: "Report on the Work of the Assembly," No. 01/1-012-54/93, ICTY Archives.
151. Izveštaji sa raspava [Reports on proceedings], *Bosnia and Herzegovina v. Paunović*, No. X-KR-05/16; especially, testimony of Zoran Bojević.
152. Ibid. (See the testimony of Jasmina Delija.)
153. Ibid. (See the testimony of Nadža Isaković.)
154. Ibid.
155. Ibid. (See the testimony of Mile Ujić.)
156. Ibid.
157. Ibid. (See the testimony of Goran Kozić.)
158. Agić, *Živi štitovi*, 91.
159. Ibid., 92.
160. Ibid., 91.
161. Izveštaji sa rasprava, *Bosnia and Herzegovina v. Paunović*; testimony of Ago Kapo.
162. Ibid.
163. Ibid. (See the testimony of Armin Bazdara.)
164. Ibid.
165. Agić, *Živi štitovi*, 34.
166. Nusret E. Agić, interview with author, Sarajevo, May 21, 2007.
167. Agić, *Živi štitovi*, 35.
168. Ibid., 36.
169. Ibid., 75.
170. Ibid., 77.
171. Borivoje Lelek, interview with author, Rogatica, May 29, 2007.

172. Myrna Goldenberg, "Sex, Rape, and Survival: Jewish Women and the Holocaust," in *Women and the Holocaust: Essays*, http://www.theverylongview.com/WATH/essays/sexrapesurvival.htm (accessed November 11, 2011).
173. See: Human Rights Watch, *World Report 2007*, "Sudan: Events of 2006," http://hrw.org/englishwr2k7/docs/2007/01/11/sudan14715.htm (accessed November 11, 2011).
174. *Prosecutor v. Kunarac et al.*, No. IT-96-23.
175. Judgment, *Prosecutor v. Jean-Paul Akayesu*, No. ICTR-96-4 (September 2, 1998).
176. Ibid.
177. Bakira Hasečić, interview with author, Sarajevo, April 17, 2007.
178. Hammurabi (729 to 686) was a Babylonian king and founder of the Babylon kingdom. *Hammurabi's Book of Laws* was written in cuneiform script and engraved into a pillar of black diorite, now in the Louvre.
179. Susan Brownmiller, *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1975), 9.
180. Peter Karsten, *Law, Soldiers, and Combat* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1978).
181. "International Justice Failing Rape Victims," *IWPR Special Report, no.* 483, January 5, 2007.
182. Ibid.
183. Ibid.
184. Ibid.
185. Brownmiller, *Against Our Will*, 38.
186. Interview with Biljana Plavšić, *Svet*, September 6, 1993.
187. Ibid.
188. United Nations Economic and Social Council, E/CN.4/1993/50, 19.
189. From source quoted in Tucaković, *Srpski zločini nad Bošnjacima*, 75.
190. "Chetnik Crimes in the Foča Region: A Report by the Military Command of the NDH," Sarajevo, January 12, 1942, published in V. Dedijer and A. Miletić, *Genocid nad Muslimanima, 1941–1945* (Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1990), 100–102; Smail Čekić, *Genocid nad Bošnjacima u Drugom svjetskom ratu* (Sarajevo: Association of Muslims against Genocidal Activities, 1996), 73–74.
191. Preljub Tafro and Bećir Macić, *Genocid nad Bošnjacima na području općine Foča: 1992–1995* (Sarajevo: Institute for Research of Crimes against Humanity and International Law, 2004), 15–18.
192. See, for instance: "General Background," Judgment, *Prosecutor v. Kunarac et al.*, No. IT-96-23 and 23/1 (February 22, 2001).
193. Ibid.
194. Ibid.
195. Ibid.
196. United Nations Economic and Social Council, E/CN.4/1993/50, 9.
197. "General Background," Judgment, *Prosecutor v. Kunarac et al.*
198. Ibid.
199. For more on Raphael Lemkin, see chapter 1.
200. On genocide in Foča see: Hasan Balić, "Bosanska kataklizma: Studija slučaja Foča," (master's thesis, University of Sarajevo, 2002).

201. "Letter from the Warden of KP Dom, Zoran Sekulovic, Submitting Information on KP Dom," Report No. 01-328/98, Exhibit P2/P2a, *Prosecutor v. Todović and Rašević*, No. IT-97-25/1 (October 26, 1998). This brief report is identified in English versions of Court of BiH documents in the case against Todorović and Rašević as including a list of "persons subjected to forced labour" from April 1992 to October 1994 (for example, in the Verdict, of February 28, 2008: www.sudbih.gov.ba/files/docs/presude/2008/Rasevic_and_Todovic_-_Verdict.pdf); more accurately, the list was of conscripts to the VRS who were committed to serve "part of the time on front lines and a part of the time on work obligation" at the Foča Penal and Correctional Facility (from the English translation of the document submitted to the ICTY).
202. "General Background," Judgment, *Prosecutor v. Kunarac et al.*
203. Ibid.
204. Ibid.
205. Ibid.
206. Ibid.
207. Ibid.
208. Ibid.
209. Ibid.
210. Ibid.
211. Ibid.
212. Ibid.
213. Ibid.
214. Ibid.
215. Ibid.
216. Roy Gutman, *Witness to Genocide* (Zagreb: Durieux, 1994), 101–2.
217. United Nations Security Council, "Final Report of the Commission of Experts Established Pursuant to Security Council Resolution 780 (1992)," No. S/1994/674 (May 27, 1994).
218. Catharine A. MacKinnon, "Rape, Genocide and Women's Human Rights," *Harvard Women's Law Journal* 17 (1994): 8–9.
219. Sentencing Judgment, *Prosecutor v. Zelenović*, No. IT-96-23/2 (April 4, 2007).
220. Court Proceedings, *Prosecutor v. Zelenović*, No. IT-96-23/2 (February 23, 2007), 529.
221. For the sociopsychological reasons a population accepts genocide committed in its name or participates in genocide directly, see chapter 5.
222. On the shocking and authentic testimonies of the suffering of Bosniaks in Višegrad throughout history, see: Mustafa Sućeska, *Krvava ćuprija na Drini* (Sarajevo: DES, 2001); for authentic documents on genocide against Bosniaks in Višegrad during World War II, see: Čekić, *Genocid nad Bošnjacima*.
223. Tucaković, *Srpski zločini nad Bošnjacima*, 48.
224. Ibid.
225. Sućeska, *Krvava ćuprija na Drini*, 10.
226. Second Amended Indictment, *Prosecutor v. Lukić and Lukić*, No. IT-98-32/1 (February 27, 2006), para. 24.
227. Judgment, *Prosecutor v. Vasiljević*, No. IT-98-32 (November 29, 2002).

228. Ibid.
229. Ibid.
230. Ibid.; this and the following three paragraphs constitute an account of events as described in the Vasiljević Judgment.
231. Ibid.
232. United Nations Security Council Resolution 757 (1992), No. S/RES/757 (May 30, 1992).
233. Judgment, *Prosecutor v. Vasiljević*. Also see: United Nations Security Council, S/1994/674, paras. 246–50 and 540–56.
234. Ibid.
235. Second Amended Indictment, *Prosecutor v. Lukić and Lukić*.
236. Judgment, *Prosecutor v. Vasiljević*, para. 48.
237. Ibid.
238. United Nations Economic and Social Council, E/CN.4/1993/50, 9.
239. Sućeska, *Krvava ćuprija na Drini*, 314.
240. Ed Vulliamy, "Bloody Trail of Butchery at the Bridge," *Guardian*, March 11, 1996.
241. Ibid.
242. Interview with author, Višegrad, November 7, 2008. This interview was conducted together with Rachel Irwin, the IWPR journalist. Our research was first published in a special IWPR report entitled "Višegrad in Denial over Grisly Past," in December 2008. The article was then published in early 2009 in *IWPR Tribunal Update* 582, and is available at: http://iwpr.net/report-news/visegrad-denial-over-grisly-past (accessed January 24, 2012).
243. Judgment, *Prosecutor v. Vasiljević*, para. 50.
244. Sućeska, *Krvava ćuprija na Drini*, 315.
245. Judgment, *Prosecutor v. Vasiljević*, para. 53.
246. Ibid., paras. 53–55.
247. The Supreme Court of Serbia confirmed in April 2006 that Milan Lukić, Oliver Krsmanović, Dragutin Dragićević, and Đordje Šević were responsible for this crime.
248. Judgment, *Prosecutor v. Vasiljević*, para. 55.
249. Omerdić, *Prilozi izučavanju genocida nad Bosnjacima*, 289.
250. Judgment, *Prosecutor v. Vasiljević*.
251. Ibid., para. 56.
252. Testimony of Radomir Vasiljević, *Prosecutor v. Vasiljević*, No. IT-98-32, Transcript (November 26, 2001), 3169.
253. Further testimony makes clear that the Bosniak woman who was denied treatment by Dr. Vasiljević did survive.
254. Testimony of Radomir Vasiljević, *Prosecutor v. Vasiljević* (November 26, 2001), 3177.
255. Ibid., 3178.
256. Bakira Hasečić, interview with author, Sarajevo, April 17, 2007.
257. Dr. D. K. agreed to talk to us only on condition that we not use her full name.
258. Dr. D. K., interview with author, Višegrad, April 21, 2007.
259. Ibid.
260. N. N., interview with author, Višegrad, November 7, 2008.

261. Vulliamy, “Bloody Trail of Butchery.”
262. Hasečić, interview.
263. James E. Mace, “Famine and Nationalism in Soviet Ukraine,” *Problems of Communism* 33 (1984): 37–55.
264. Brunetau, *Stoljeće genocida*, 43.
265. Ibid.
266. Richard G. Hovannisian, “The Historical Dimensions of the Armenian Question,” in *Armenian Genocide in Perspective*, ed. Richard G. Hovannisian (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 1986), 51. For a detailed explanation of why the imposition of famine was the most used method of genocide against Armenians, see: Robert Melson, *Revolution and Genocide: On the Origins of the Armenian Genocide and Holocaust* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992).
267. Bruneteau, *Stoljeće genocida*, 106.
268. Craig Etcheson, *After the Killing Fields: Lessons from the Cambodian Genocide* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2005).
269. The industrialization of human death in Nazi concentration camps through implementation of an operation known as “Reinhard,” in which a million and a half Jews were killed in Poland in 1942 and 1943, has been well documented. This operation and the terror inflicted on the detainees of three camps (Belzec, Sobibor, and Treblinka) were described (and supported by documentation) in: Yitzak Arad, *Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka: The Operation Reinhard Death Camps* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987).
270. Helen Fein quotes Warren Christopher, former U.S. secretary of state, who espoused the thesis that crimes were being committed on all sides as an argument against American military intervention. Taken from: Helen Fein, “Civil Wars and Genocide: Paths and Circles,” *Human Rights Review* 1, no. 3 (April–June 2000): 51.
271. Yehuda Bauer, “Forms of Jewish Resistance,” in *The Holocaust*, ed. Donald L. Niewyk (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1997), 119–20.
272. Ibid., 122.
273. Džemo Jusić was from Podčauš, and Nedžad Hodžić from Hranča. When they were killed on September 30, 1991, Mevludin Sinanović from Glogova and Zaim Salihović from Tokoljak were also seriously wounded. Many Bosniaks consider this event to mark the beginning of Serb aggression, especially since the executors of the crime were not apprehended, despite being known to the police.
274. Nijaz Mašić, *Istina o Bratuncu: Agresija, genocid, oslobodilačka borba 1992–1995* (Tuzla: Bratunac Municipality, 1996), 20–21.
275. Ademović, interview.
276. Suad Smailović, interview with author, Tuzla, July 7, 2006.
277. Ibid.
278. Ademović, interview.
279. Smailović, interview.
280. Ejub Dedić, interview with author, Tuzla, May 13, 2007; Muriz Bektić, interview with author, The Hague, November 20, 2006; Nadžad Bektić, interview with author, Sarajevo, December 15, 2006.
281. Nijaz Mašić, interview with author, Sarajevo, July 1, 2006.

282. This summary results from analysis of interviews with numerous witnesses to these events.
283. Sabra Kolenović, interview with author, Sarajevo, June 22, 2006.
284. Mašić, interview.
285. Smailović, interview.
286. United Nations, "Special Sitrep—Srebrenica: Gen Morillon Left Srebrenica Together with 673 Persons and 100 Wounded" (March 20, 1993), Institute for the Research of Crimes against Humanity and International Law Archive, Sarajevo.
287. As relayed in Larry Hollingworth, *Merry Christmas Mr Larry* (London: Mandarin, 1997), 215–16; chapter 10 of Hollingworth's text was submitted as evidence (Exhibit D218) by the defense in *Prosecutor v. Orić*, No. IT-03-68.
288. Smailović, interview.
289. Mesud Omerović, interview with author, Sarajevo, December 14, 2006.
290. Kolenović, interview.
291. Nesib Burić, interview with author, Sarajevo, November 3, 2006.
292. Ejub Gušter, interview with author, Sarajevo, August 17, 2006; Gušter was among those living in cardboard boxes on Srebrenica's streets.
293. Kolenović, interview.
294. Testimony of Slavoljub Zikic, *Prosecutor v. Orić*, No. IT-03-68, Transcript (December 16, 2004), 3338–39.
295. Laura Silber and Allan Little, *The Death of Yugoslavia* (London: Penguin Books/BBC Books, 1996).
296. Republika Srpska Army Headquarters, "Future Operations of the Republika Srpska Army, for the Commander: Directive No. 4," issued by Major-General Manojlo Milovanovic and signed by Commander Ratko Mladić, No. 02/5-21, November 19, 1992, ICTY Archives.
297. Ibid., 7.
298. Republika Srpska Army Headquarters, "Amendments to Directive No. 4," signed by R. Mladić, No. 02/5-210, December 7, 1992, ICTY Archives.
299. "DC" is the abbreviation generally used for the Drina Corps.
300. Supreme Command of Republika Srpska, "Basic Characteristics of the International Military-Political Situation," No. 2/2-11, March 8, 1995, ICTY Archives.
301. United Nations, "Report on Assessment of the Situation in Cerska on 5-6-Mar-93," No. R0012-2225–R012-2231, March 7, 1993. This report detailed Morillon's visit to Cerska and Konjević Polje on March 5 and 6, 1993.
302. Ibid.
303. United Nations, "Special Sitrep—Srebrenica, to Inform that the Humanitarian Aid Convoy Was Blocked by Bosnian Serb Troops Outside Zvornik," No. 182230A, March 18, 1993, ICTY Archives.
304. United Nations, "Special Sitrep—Srebrenica: Gen Morillon Left Srebrenica Together with 673 Persons and 100 Wounded."
305. Testimony of Ambassador Diego Arria, *Prosecutor v. Orić*, No. IT-03-68, Transcript, (December 5, 2005), 14349.
306. Ibid., 14339.

307. Ibid., 14357. Emphasis added.
308. Ibid., 14350.
309. Michael Waltzer, *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations* (New York: Basic Books, 1977).
310. "Instructions for the 4th Corps Command's Work in Completion of Priority Tasks in War and Peace," signed by Major Đurdjevac, No. 01/15-62, August 29, 1991, ICTY Archives, p. 2.
311. "Bratunac Brigade Command," Strictly Confidential No. 2-1942-2, Exhibit D807/807e, *Prosecutor v. Orić*, No. IT-03-68 (December 28, 1992).
312. "Video footage showing part of a speech of the commander of the Drina Corps, General Milenko Živanović, on the establishment of the Bratunac Brigade, on the 14th of November, 1992," Exhibit D72, *Prosecutor v Orić*, No. IT-03-68.
313. The video Exhibit D72 cited above and presented by the defense was an excerpt edited from various footage on tape No. V000-3937, including part of Živanović's rallying speech and then jumping to some of the later aftermath, with English translation; an undated audio recording ("CDs of Video no. 2 seized in Bratunac, not dated"), also identified as V000-3937, including more footage of that same event and of others, was presented as evidence by the prosecution in the Orić case, as Exhibit P317. It is on this recording that Andrić is heard speaking after Živanović.
314. "Video footage . . .," Exhibit D72, *Prosecutor v. Orić*.
315. Testimony of Pyers Tucker, *Prosecutor v. Orić*, No. IT-03-68, Transcript (March 15, 2005), 5959.

CHAPTER 5. THE EIGHTH STAGE OF GENOCIDE—DENIAL

1. Helmut Dubiel, *Niko nije oslobođen istorije: Nacionalistička vlast u debatama Bundestaga* (Belgrade: Samizdat B92, 2002), 15. Originally published in German as: *Niemand ist frei von der Geschichte: Die nationalsocialistische Herrschaft in den Debatten des Deutschen Bundestages* (Munich: Carl Hanser, 1999).
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., 16.
4. Richard von Weizsäcker, *Speech in the Bundestag during the Ceremony Commemorating the 40th Anniversary of the End of War in Europe and of National-Socialist Tyranny*, May 8, 1985, trans. Auswärtiges Amt, Germany, http://mediaculture-online.de/fileadmin/bibliothek/weizsaecker_speech_may85/weizsaecker_speech_may85.pdf (last accessed October 27, 2013).
5. Karl Jaspers, *Pitanje krivice* (Belgrade: Samizdat Free B92, 1999).
6. Ibid., 23.
7. Ibid.
8. Drinka Gojković, "The Future in a Triangle: On Guilt, Truth, and Change," *Reč* 59, no. 5 (September 2000): 65–75. Available at: http://www.b92.net/casopis_rec/59.5/sadrzaj.html (accessed November 11, 2011).
9. The terms "saviors," "rescuers," and "upstanders" are used somewhat interchangeably to describe people who act to assist or save the lives of others in the face of genocidal or criminal actions. In this book, "saviors" is used. For more on the roles people play

in genocidal processes, see: Raul Hilberg, *Perpetrators, Victims, Bystanders* (New York: Perennial, 1993); V. J. Barnett, *Bystanders* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2000); and E. Fogelman, *Conscience and Courage* (New York: Random/Anchor, 1994).

10. Norman Cigar, *Genocide in Bosnia: The Policy of Ethnic Cleansing* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1995).
11. See the Rogatica case study in chapter 4.
12. Testimony of Ibro Osmanović, *Prosecutor v. Nikolić*, No. IT-94-2, Transcript (October 10, 1995), 271.
13. Testimony of Redjo Čakišić, ibid., 311.
14. Cigar, *Genocide in Bosnia*, 84.
15. Emir Suljagić, "Community of Murder" (master's thesis, University of Sarajevo/University of Bologna, 2005), 51.
16. Ibid.
17. Walter Laqueur, *The Terrible Secret: Suppression of the Truth about Hitler's Final Solution* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1980), 201.
18. Stanley Cohen, *States of Denial* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001), 148.
19. Testimony of Milenija Mitrović, *Prosecutor v. Orić*, No. IT-03-68, Transcript (October 22, 2004), 1042.
20. Ibid.
21. Cohen, *States of Denial*, 148.
22. Ibid.
23. Ibid.
24. Testimony of Novka Božić, *Prosecutor v. Orić*, No. IT-03-68, Transcript (October 27, 2004), 1307.
25. Ibid., 1308.
26. Hamed Tiro, interview with author, Tuzla, September 16, 2006.
27. Testimony of Novka Božić (October 27, 2004), 1307.
28. Ibid., 1310.
29. Ibid.
30. Cohen, *States of Denial*, 5.
31. Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1956), 50.
32. Testimony of Slavka Matić, *Prosecutor v. Orić*, No. IT-03-68, Transcript (November 30, 2004), 2226.
33. Gordon J. Horwitz, *In the Shadow of Death: Living Outside the Gates of Mauthausen* (London: I. B. Tauris, 1991), 35.
34. Erich Fromm uses the construction "alienation from human life" to explain the reasons people tend to commit crimes. In the final part of this chapter, where I present the conclusions of this comparative study on "denial of crime," there is also a detailed explanation of Fromm's scheme described in his book *Beyond the Chains of Illusions: My Encounter with Marx and Freud*.
35. In his guilty plea, Momir Nikolić named Nikola Popović as one of the perpetrators of crimes against Bosniaks in Srebrenica in July 1995. See: "Statement of Facts and Acceptance of Responsibility," Joint Motion for Consideration of the Plea Agreement Between Momir Nikolić and the Office of the Prosecutor, *Prosecutor v. Nikolić*,

No. IT-02-60 (May 6, 2003). Available at: http://www.icty.org/x/cases/nikolic/pros/en/030506.pdf; also see: Lauren Etell, "Oric Is Infuriated by the Witness," *Tribunal Update*, no. 384 (December 3, 2004).

36. Ibid.
37. Statement of Facts and Acceptance of Responsibility, *Prosecutor v. Nikolić*, 5.
38. Cohen, *States of Denial*, 78.
39. Testimony of Dragan Đurić, *Prosecutor v. Orić*, No. IT-03-68, Transcript (October 14, 2004), 744.
40. Ibid, 757–59.
41. Ibid.
42. Testimony of Slavoljub Filipović, *Prosecutor v. Orić*, No. IT-03-68, Transcript (December 3, 2004), 2529.
43. Testimony of Nikola Petrović, *Prosecutor v. Orić*, No. IT-03-68, Transcript (April 15, 2005), 7326–29.
44. Ibid.
45. Testimony of Nikola Popović, *Prosecutor v. Orić*, No. IT-03-68, Transcript (December 9, 2004), 2847.
46. Ibid., 2849.
47. Cohen, *States of Denial*, 78.
48. Ervin Staub, "Preventing Genocide: Activating Bystanders, Helping Victims Heal, Helping Groups Overcome Hostility," in *Studies in Comparative Genocide*, ed. Levon Chorbajian and George Shirnian (London: Macmillan Press, 1999), 258.
49. Linda M. Woolf and Michael R. Hulsizer, "Psychological Roots of Genocide: Risk, Prevention, and Intervention," *Journal of Genocide Research* (March, 2005), 102.
50. See chapter 2 for more on the influence of Njegoš on the creation of a "culture of violence" in Serbian and Montenegrin tradition.
51. Milorad Ekmečić, "Profiles of Societies in the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century," in *History of Yugoslavia*, ed. Milorad Ekmečić et al. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974), 372, cited in Branimir Anzulovic, *Heavenly Serbia: From Myth to Genocide* (London: C. Hurst, 1999), 61.
52. Anzulovic, *Heavenly Serbia*, 61–67.
53. Milovan Đilas, *Land Without Justice* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1958), 130.
54. Ibid., 207.
55. Ibid.
56. Chuck Sudetic, *Blood and Vengeance* (New York: Penguin Books, 1999), 349.
57. Ibid.
58. Ibid., 351.
59. Ibid., 352.
60. Ibid., 349.
61. See: Ervin Staub, "Turning against Others: The Origins of Antagonism and Group Violence," *Bulletin of Peace Psychology* 1 (1992): 11–14. See also: Staub, "Preventing Genocide." In both essays, Staub points to ideologies of antagonism as a necessary condition for the perpetration of genocide.

62. K. S. Bjornson and Kurt Jonassohn, "The Former Yugoslavia: Some Historical Roots of Present Conflicts," Montreal Institute for Genocide and Human Rights Studies, Concordia University (1994), cited in: Staub, "Preventing Genocide," 255.
63. Petar Petrovic Njegos, "The Mountain Wreath" (Vienna, 1847), English translation by Vasa D. Mihajlovic, line 36. See chapter 2 for more on "The Mountain Wreath."
64. Cohen, *States of Denial*, 64.
65. Daniel Goleman, *Vital Lies, Simple Truths: The Psychology of Self-Deception* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1985), 17.
66. Jane Loevinger, *Ego Development* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976).
67. Ibid.
68. Steven K. Baum, "A Bell Curve of Hate," *Journal of Genocide Research* 6, no. 4 (December 2004): 569.
69. Shorter interpretation of Baum's scheme, ibid., 567–77.
70. Testimony of Dragomir Miladinović, *Prosecutor v. Orić*, No. IT-03-68, Transcript (December 13, 2004), 2982.
71. When Serbs identify them with "Turks," Bosniaks see this as a denial of their own national identity and therefore as a pejorative insult.
72. See: Merdijana Sadovic, "Inconsistencies Mar Orić Trial: Witness Rebuked for Inappropriate Attitude as Court Hears of Attacks on Serb villages," *TRI*, no. 386 (November 9, 2005), http://iwpr.net/report-news/inconsistencies-mar-oric-trial (accessed November 11, 2011). Emphasis added.
73. Testimony of Miloš Okanović, *Prosecutor v. Orić*, No. IT-03-68, Transcript (May 6, 2005), 7932.
74. Ibid. (May 9, 2005), 7987.
75. Baum, "A Bell Curve of Hate," 567–77.
76. See the Rogatica case study in chapter 4.
77. Ibid.
78. See: "Trebinje će podići spomenik mladiću koji je branio Bošnjake," *Prve crnogorske nezavisne elektronske novine* (*PCNEN*), March 5, 2007.
79. F. Prato, J. Sidanius, L. M. Stallworth, and B. F. Malle, "Social Dominance Orientation: A Personality Variable Predicting Social and Political Attitudes," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 67, no. 4 (October 1994): 741–63, cited in Woolf and Hulsizer, "Psychological Roots of Genocide," 103.
80. R. F. Baumeister, L. Smart, and J. M. Boden, "Relation of Threatened Egoism to Violence and Aggression: The Dark Side of High Self-Esteem," *Psychological Review* 103, no. 1 (January 1996): 5–33, cited in Woolf and Hulsizer, "Psychological Roots of Genocide," 103.
81. C. I. Hovland and R. R. Sears, "Minor Studies of Aggression: VI. Correlation of Lynchings with Economic Indices," *Journal of Psychology* 9 (1940): 301–10, cited in Woolf and Hulsizer, "Psychological Roots of Genocide," 112.
82. Woolf and Hulsizer, "Psychological Roots of Genocide," 112; Erich Fromm, *Beyond the Chains of Illusion: My Encounter with Freud and Marx* (New York: Continuum, 2001).
83. Fromm, *Beyond the Chains of Illusion*, 13.

84. Ibid., 11.
85. Ibid., 15.
86. Ibid., 125.
87. Ibid., 126.
88. Ibid.
89. Ibid., 126–27.
90. Ibid.
91. Ibid.
92. Ibid., 128.
93. Defense Closing Brief, *Prosecutor v. Orić*, No. IT-03-68 (March 17, 2006), paras. 22–23.
94. See the Srebrenica case study in chapter 4.
95. Testimony of Ambassador Diego Arria, *Prosecution v. Orić*, No. IT-03-68, Transcript (December 5, 2005), 14388.
96. For more details about bystanders and the denial of genocide against Jews, see: Cohen, *States of Denial*, 161.
97. Ibid.
98. For the analysis of public response in the West to concentration camps in Bosnia and Herzegovina during the 1992–1995 aggression, see: David Campbell, "Atrocity, Memory, Photography: Imaging the Concentration Camps of Bosnia—The Case of ITN versus Living Marxism," available at: http://www.david-campbell.org/photography/atrocity-and-memory/ (accessed November 11, 2011).
99. Mark Danner, "America and the Bosnia Genocide," *New York Review of Books*, December 4, 1997.
100. [No author listed,] "The Second Markale Massacre Myth," *SENSE Tribunal*, January 16, 2007, http://www.sense-agency.com/icty/the-second-markale-massacre-myth.29.html?cat_id=1&news_id=10035 (accessed November 11, 2011).
101. Ibid.
102. Cohen, *States of Denial*, 162.
103. Ibid.
104. Israel W. Charny, "The Psychological Satisfaction of Denials of the Holocaust or Other Genocides by Non-Extremists or Bigots, and Even by Known Scholars," *Idea: A Journal of Social Issues* 6, no. 1 (July 17, 2001), http://www.ideajournal.com/articles.php?id=27 (accessed May 30, 2007).
105. Marko Attila Hoare, "Genocide in the Former Yugoslavia: A Critique of Left Revisionism's Denial," *Journal of Genocide Research* 5, no. 4 (2003): 553.
106. For a review of World War II casualties, see: Vladimir Dedijer and Antun Miletić, *Genocid nad Muslimanima 1941–1945: Zbornik dokumenata I svjedočenja* (Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1990).
107. Hoare, "Genocide in the Former Yugoslavia," 556.
108. The quotes in this paragraph from House of Commons and House of Lords Parliamentary debates from May 1995 are given in: Daniel Conversi, "Moral Relativism and Equidistance in British Attitudes to the War in the Former Yugoslavia," in *This Time We Knew: Western Responses to Genocide in Bosnia*, ed. Thomas Cushman and Stjepan G. Meštrović (New York: New York University Press, 1996), 257.

109. Taylor Branch, *The Clinton Tapes: Wrestling History with the President* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2009), 9–10.
110. Richard Johnson, as quoted in: David Halberstam, *War in a Time of Peace: Bush, Clinton and the Generals* (New York: Scribner, 2001), 135. For a full exposé on how the foreign policy of the United States and European countries encouraged Slobodan Milošević's war of aggression, see: Josip Glaurdić, *The Hour of Europe: Western Powers and the Breakup of Yugoslavia* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011).
111. Michael Mann, *The Dark Side of Democracy: Explaining Ethnic Cleansing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 21.
112. Edward S. Herman and David Peterson, *The Politics of Genocide* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2010).
113. Ibid., 46.
114. Ibid., 47.
115. Ibid., 12. Convincing deconstructions of arguments presented in *The Politics of Genocide* include: Martin Shaw, "Left-Wing Genocide Denial: A Review of *The Politics of Genocide*," *Journal of Genocide Research* 13, no. 3 (2011): 353–58; Adam Jones, "On Genocide Deniers—Challenging Herman and Peterson," AllAfrica, July 16, 2011; and Marko Attila Hoare, "Srebrenica Deniers Get Their Mucky Paws on Rwanda," *Greater Surbiton: The Perfect Is the Enemy of the Good* (blog), September 7, 2010, http://greatersurbiton.wordpress.com/2010/09/07/srebrenica-deniers-get-their-mucky-paws-on-rwanda/ (accessed August 30, 2012).
116. Decision on Motion for Judgment of Acquittal, *Prosecutor v. Milosevic*, No. IT-02-54 (June 16, 2004), 115.
117. Edina Bećirević, "ICJ Judgment Significant Despite Flaws," *IWPR Tribunal Update* 491 (March 3, 2007).
118. See: "Case Concerning Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide," Judgment, *Bosnia and Herzegovina v. Serbia and Montenegro* (February 26, 2007). The judgment is available online at: http://www.icj-cij.org/docket/files/91/13685.pdf (accessed August 30, 2012).
119. Sonja Biserko and Edina Bećirević, "Negiranje genocida," *BH Dani*, October 9, 2009.
120. "Ekonomska kriza čuva Mladića: Interview with Rasim Ljajić, President of the National Council for the Cooperation with the Tribunal," *B92*, May 15, 2011.
121. "News at 19:30," BiH TV, May 26, 2011, author's note.
122. Edina Bećirević, "Mladic's Arrest Hasn't Ended Denial in Serbia," *IWPR Tribunal Update* 695, May 31, 2011, http://iwpr.net/report-news/mladic-arrest-hasnt-ended-denial-serbia (accessed January 12, 2012).
123. [No author listed,] "Izvinjenje RTS zbog 90-ih," *Večernje Novosti*, May 23, 2011, http://www.novosti.rs/vesti/naslovna/aktuelno.69.html:331598-Izvinjenje-RTS-zbog-90-ih (accessed August 30, 2012).
124. Goran Svilanović, speech at the International Conference on the Western Balkans, June 14, 2011, author's notes; Svilanović was the minister of foreign affairs in the government of Zoran Đinđić, Serbian prime minister from 2001 until his assassination in 2003.

AFTERWORD

1. Indira Haračić, e-mail correspondence with author, July 3, 2006. Haračić is a clinical psychologist of Bosnian descent who works for S.T.A.R.T.T.S. (Service for the Treatment and Rehabilitation of Torture and Trauma Survivors) in Sydney, Australia.
2. Ibid.
3. Ivo Andrić was a Yugoslav novelist of Bosnian Croat descent. In 1961 he won the Nobel Prize in Literature, largely for his book *Na Drini ćuprija* (*The Bridge over the Drina*). The book is set in Višegrad and centers around the Mehmed Paša Sokolović Bridge, over the Drina River; it covers the four centuries of life under Ottoman rule, and the plot focuses on relations between the Bosnian Muslim and Orthodox populations. Some literary critics have criticized Andrić for portraying Bosnian Muslims in an exclusively negative light, treating them as "Turks," and inspiring Serbian nationalistic hatred toward them. For this argument, see: Muhsin Rizvić, *Bosanski Muslimani u Andrićevom svijetu* (Sarajevo: Ljiljan, 1995). Andrić was also known for understanding Bosnia as a country of hatred. As Ivo Banac puts it, "Perhaps one of the most important writers from the land of Bosnia has, posthumously, become an inspiration for those who are destroying it. His views have become part of the thesis—advanced by, among others, Robert D. Kaplan [author of *Balkan Ghosts: A Journey through History* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993)]—that the people of Bosnia . . . are the best haters around. These are banal half-truths. There is no sane reason to believe that in this particular corner of the world there is some sort of a special concentration of hate. Human beings are human beings everywhere." See: Rabia Ali, "Separating History from Myth: An Interview with Ivo Banac," in *Why Bosnia?* (Stony Creek, CT: Pamphleteer's Press, 1993), 164.
4. This and all other quotes are from three conversations the author had with Kym Vercoe in Sarajevo in May 2010. Also see: Edina Bećirević, "Sve kuće u Višegradu nisu srušene," *Dani*, September 3, 2010; and Edina Bećirević, "Memories of Rape: Hotel Vilina Vlas, Višegrad—Then and Now," *Descant* 156, vol. 43, no. 1 (Spring 2012).
5. Rachel Irwin and Edina Bećirević, "Višegrad in Denial Over Grisly Past," *IWPR Tribunal Update* 582 (February 24, 2009), http://iwpr.net/report-news/visegrad-denial-over-grisly-past (accessed January 24, 2012).
6. Nidžara Ahmetašević, Nerma Jelačić, and Selma Boračić, "Niko ne čuje vapaj žrtava silovanja iz Višegrada," *BIRN*, December 2007.
7. Bećirević, "Memories of Rape: Hotel Vilina Vlas, Višegrad—Then and Now."
8. See: Tara Parsons, "Theater: Seven Kilometres North-East," Alternative Media Group of Australia, September 27, 2010, http://www.altmedia.net.au/theatre-seven-kilometres-north-east/24994 (accessed September 1, 2012); and "Seven Kilometres North-East," Projects, Version 1.0, http://www.versiononepointzero.com/index.php/projects/seven_kilometres_north_east (accessed September 1, 2012).
9. Jasmila Žbanić, interview with author, Sarajevo, June 25, 2012. Filming was completed, and the film, *For Those Who Can Tell No Tales*, had its world premiere at the Toronto Film Festival on September 7, 2013.

This page intentionally left blank

INDEX

Abdić, Fikret, 198*n*5
Abu Ghraib prison abuse, 13
"Actions for food," 137–38
Ademović, Sidik, 83, 134, 135
Adžić, Blagoje, 73
Agency for Real Estate Exchange, 93
Agentic state, 12, 146
Agić, Nusret, 111–12, 114
Agius, Carmel, 152, 161
Agrokomerc, 51, 198*n*5
Ahmetspahić, Jasmina, 184–85
Akayesu, Jean-Paul, 116–17
Aladža Mosque, 121
Albanians: and demographics of Kosovo, 16, 17, 22, 30, 37; nationalism, 17–18, 26, 27
Aleksić, Srđan, 164
Aljić, Meho, 128, 129
Almer, Gerhard, 36
Altruistic worldview, 164
Alvarez, Alex, 10–11
Amanpour, Christiane, ix
Amnesty International, 184
Analytical framework, xiii, 1–15; comparative genocide research, 4–7; dehumanization of victims, 10–14; genocidal plan, 7–10; Holocaust research, 4–7; ideology, 7–10; Lemkin's influence, 1–4; mass participation by perpetrators, 10–14; phases of genocide, 14–15; state role, 7–10
Andrić, Ivo, 130, 181, 185, 223*n*3
Andrić, Svetozar, 99, 143
Anglo-Boer War of 1899–1902, 132
Anti-Semitism, 11
Anzulovic, Branimir, 155
Arkan's Tigers: and Bratunac genocide, 105; role of, 76; and Srebrenica genocide, 135; and Zvornik genocide, 89, 90, 91. *See also* Ražnatović, Željko (Arkan)
Armenian genocide, 1–2, 4, 86, 132, 172
Arming of Serbs: in Bratunac, 103–6; in Srebrenica, 134–35; in Višegrad, 125–26; in Zvornik, 90–91
Army of the Republika Srpska (VRS), 75, 138–39
Arnautovića Mosque, 111
Arria, Diego, 140, 141, 169
Artillery shelling: of Sarajevo, 63; in Srebrenica, 140–42; of Zvornik, 91
"As Long as the Drina Flows" (Savčić), 81
Assembly of the Serb People of Bosnia and Herzegovina, 58
Association of Municipalities, 35, 53
Australia, indigenous people as targets of violence in, 7–8

Authoritarian regimes, 72–73
Avramov, Smilja, 199*n*20

Babić, Milan, 62, 201*n*44
Baćović, Petar, 119
Badinter, Robert, 54
Badinter Commission, 54, 58
Bajina Bašta hydropower plant, 127
Balčaković, Mile, 115
Balkan Investigative Reporting Network, 184
Balkan Pact (1953), 195*n*47
Banac, Ivo, 20, 36, 56, 193*n*35
Banja Luka Corps, 62
Banjanović, Fadil, 94–95
Banjica concentration camp, 88
Batković concentration camp, 100
Battle of Kosovo (1389), xiv, 40–42
Bauer, Yehuda, 133–34
Baum, Steven K., 162, 163
Bazdara, Armin, 114
Begić, Rifat, 105, 209*n*119
Bergholz, Max, 46
Berić, Gojko, 66
Bijeljina: ICJ on responsibility for genocide in, 176; JNA attack on, 64, 88; paramilitary forces in, 74
Bikavac, 128
Bilandžić, Dušan, 55, 199*n*20
Blood and Vengeance (Sudetic), 159
Boban, Mate, 52, 56
Bojević, Zoran, 113
Boltzman Institute for Human Rights, 90, 94
Bosanski Brod, Serb attack on, 63–64
Bosanski Novi, ICJ on responsibility for genocide in, 176
Bosanski Šamac, Serb attack on, 64
Bosnia: A Short History (Malcolm), 193*n*26
Bosnia and Herzegovina: demographics of, 17; independence referendum, 54–57, 62–64; occupation of, 50–54; political parties in, 51; World War II history of, 45. *See also* Bosnian Muslims
Bosniaks: dehumanization of, 47–49; and independence of Bosnia, 55; and national identity, 20–26; propaganda against, 47–49; resistance by, 137–38
Bosnian Book of the Dead (Research and Documentation Center), 188*n*1
Bosnian Communist Party, 25
Bosnian Muslims (Bosniaks): dehumanization of, 47–49; and independence of Bosnia, 55; and national identity, 20–26; propaganda against, 47–49; resistance by, 137–38
Boutros-Ghali, Boutros, 140–41
Božić, Novka, 149–50, 162
Božilović-Petrović, Gordana, 177
Branch, Taylor, 174
Branković, Vuk, 41, 42
Bratunac genocide, xiii, 101–10; arming of Serbs for, 103–6; confiscation of personal military documents in, 83; demographics of, 103, 204*n*8; disarming of Bosniaks in, 105; and Glogova refugees, 106–7; indictments and prosecutions for, 108–10; intellectuals' participation in, 102–3; nationalism's role in, 102–3; Serb domination of region, 107–8; Srebrenica linked to, 135
Brčko, Serb attack on, 64, 84, 176
The Bridge over the Drina (Andrić), 181, 185, 223*n*3
Brijuni Accord (1991), 35
Browning, Christopher, 11, 12
Brownmiller, Susan, 118
Buk Bijela concentration camp, 122, 123
Bulović, Irinej, 79
Bystanders: emotional development level of, 162; external passive bystanders, 168–76; in Zvornik, 88–90

Čakišić, Ređo, 147
Cambodia: forced famine in, 132; genocide in, 3, 189*n*11
Čančar, Petko, 83
Careerism, 11

Catholic Church, 23
Čekić, Smail, 71
Čelopek Dom Kulture (Cultural Center), 94
Cerska, Bosniak refugees deported to, 100
Chalk, Frank, 5, 8
Charny, Israel, 5, 172, 173, 175, 180
Chetniks, 23, 26, 45, 47, 88
Child soldiers, 95–96
Chirot, Daniel, 6
Chomsky, Noam, 172, 176
Christopher, Warren, 215*n*270
Churchill, Winston, 1
Cigar, Norman, xv, 22, 25, 45, 47, 146
Ciglana factory, 94
Classification phase of genocide, 14
Clinton, Bill, 174–75
Cohen, Roger, 101
Cohen, Stanley, 149, 152, 153, 154, 158, 170, 171
Cohn, Norman, 9
Collateral damage, 5
Colonialism, 7–8
Čolović, Ivan, 44, 81
Communist Party (Yugoslavia), 16, 18–19, 21, 29, 34
Comparative genocide research, 4–7
Concentration camps: establishment of, xv; evidence of, 84; in Foča, 121–22; forced famine in, 132; in Nazi Germany, 215*n*269; in Rogatica, 113; in Vlasenica, 95
Conformism, 12
Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1951), 1–3, 6–7, 121, 131, 171
Coordination: of Bratunac genocide, 102; of genocide, 7–10, 57–62, 84–86; JNA cooperation with SDS, 207*n*76; of Zvornik genocide, 90–95, 93
Corruption, 51
Ćosić, Dobrica, 18, 25, 194*n*41
Crimes against humanity, defined, 2
Crimes against peace, defined, 2
Crisis headquarters, 59–60, 82, 101, 208*n*99
Croatia: demilitarization agreement (1992), 36; media liberalization in, 19; Serb attacks in, 35; World War II history of, 45
Croatian Communist Party, 19, 192*n*16
Croatian Democratic Union (HDZ), 34, 52, 56
Croats, 16–17
Cultural nationalism, 40
Culture of violence, 154–59, 166
"Culturocide," 121

Daily Telegraph on genocide in Nazi Germany, 170
Dalyell, Tam, 174
Danilo, Vladika, 43
Defense budget, 73
Definitionalism, 173, 175
Dehumanization of victims: analytical framework, 10–14; and culture of violence, 155, 158; as third phase of genocide, 14
Delija, Jasmina, 113
Democratic Opposition of Slovenia (DEMOS), 34
Democratic Socialist Alliance (DSS), 51
Democratization, 50–54
Denial of genocide, xiv, 144–79; by Bosnian Serbs, 144–59; by bystanders, 148–51, 168–78; and culture of violence, 154–59; denial of active military role as defense, 151–53; and emotional ego development, 159–68; by external passive bystanders, 168–78; as final phase of genocide, 14–15; indifference as mechanism of, 148–51; by perpetrators, 151–53; pseudostupidity as mechanism of, 153–54; reoccurence linked to, 111; and saviors, 146–48; scholarly denial of genocide, 172–76; in Serbia, 176–79; in Višegrad, 183
"Denial of knowing" paradox, 148–49
Deportations, 94–95, 100, 128

Deronjić, Miroslav, 101–10, 169–70, 210*n*135
Đilas, Milovan, 155, 156
Đile, Serb attack on, 97–98
Dinkić, Mlađan, 77
Disappearances, 121
Disarming of Bosniaks: in Bratunac, 105; in Foča, 120; in Glogova, 106; in Rogatica, 112; in Srebrenica, 105; in Višegrad, 125–26; in Vlasenica, 97, 99; in Zvornik, 91
Discriminatory legislation: in Foča, 119, 120; in Vlasenica, 97; in Zvornik, 93
Dissolution of Yugoslavia, xiv, 16–49; and economic tensions, 26–30; and Kosovo myth, 30–36, 39–44; and Muslim national identity, 20–26; and propaganda, 36–39, 47–49; and World War II history, 45–47
Dobanovci meeting (1995), 78–80
Dodik, Milorad, 68–69, 179
Đogo, Gojko, 55
Đogo, Risto, 65–66
Đokić, Neško, 148
Đokić, Slobodan, 148
Donia, Robert, 64, 66, 198*n*3
Drašković, Vuk, 48
Drina Brigade, 76
Drina Corps, 139
Drina River: and Bratunac genocide, 103; Serb strategic goals for, xv, 83, 89; symbolism of, 81; and Višegrad genocide, 125; in Višegrad genocide, 127–28
DSS (Democratic Socialist Alliance), 51
Dubiel, Helmut, 144, 145
Dubrovnik, 35
Dukić, Rajko, 104
Duraković, Nijaz, 51
Durić, Bajro, 98
Đurić, Dragan, 152
Durić, Esad, 98
Đurić, Ljubinko, 147
Đurišić, Pavle, 22
Džambasović, Asim, 207*n*76
Džamdžići, Serb attack on, 98
Economics of Destruction (Dinkić), 76–77
Economic tensions, 18–19, 26–30, 87
Eisenhower, Dwight, 195*n*47
Ekmečić, Milorad, 155
Ekonomija farm, 94
Elias, Saint, 41
Ellul, Jacques, 37
Emotional ego development, 159–68; emotional authenticity, 163–64; empathy, 162, 164; first tier of, 160–62; humanistic worldview, 164; lack of, 165–68; second tier of, 162–63; and social dominance orientation, 164–65; third tier of, 163–64
Erić, Golub, 157
Erić, Mihailo, 157, 159
Erić, Nego, 157
Erić, Slaviša, 158, 162
Erić, Vaso, 156–57
Extermination phase of genocide, 14

Failure to punish, 111, 125
False consciousness, 166, 167
Famine, 131–32
Fear of isolation, 166–68
Fein, Helen, 6, 8, 10, 133, 215*n*270
Ferdinand, Franz, 157
Fetahović, Musa, 98
Fetahović, Rasim, 98
Fifth International Conference for the Unification of Penal Law, 1–2
Fikret, Arnaut, 100
Filipović, Muhamed, 52
Filipović, Slavoljub, 153
Financing of genocide, 76–78
Fine, John F., 23
First Serbian Uprising (1804), 124
Fisk, Robert, 173
Foča genocide, xiii, 116–24; attack on, 64; and concentration camps, 121–22; demographics of, 204*n*8; rape as tactic in, 117–19, 122–24; as repeat of World War II pattern, 119–21

Foča Gymnasium concentration camp, 123
Forced deportations, 94–95, 100, 128
Forced labor, 121
France, inaction by, 174–75
Freedom of movement, restrictions of, 97, 120
Freud, Sigmund, 166
Fromm, Erich, 165–68, 218*n*34

Gagović, Dragan, 122–23
Garašanin, Ilija, 21, 22, 192*n*20
Gavrić, Zoran, 115, 164
Geary, Dick, 203*n*88
Geneva Convention (1929), 118
Genocide: and authoritarianism, 72–73; in Bratunac, 101–10; defined, 1–2, 6–7; in Eastern Bosnia, xiii, 81–143; in Foča, 116–24; phases, 14–15; planning and coordination of, 7–10, 57–62, 84–86; rhetoric of, 54–57, 64–69; in Rogatica, 110–16; in Srebrenica, 131–43; systematic nature of, 8; in Višegrad, 124–31; in Vlasenica, 95–101; in Zvornik, 86–95
Genocide: Its Political Use in the Twentieth Century (Kuper), 5
Genocide Convention. *See* Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1951)
Gentili, Alberico, 117
Geostrategic importance: of Drina River, 83; of Srebrenica, 134–36; of Višegrad, 124–25; of Vlasenica, 96–97; of Zvornik, 87–88
Gerlach, Christian, 8
Germany: paramilitary forces in, 86; reunification in, 33. *See also* Nazi Germany
Giordano, Ralph, 145
Glavović, Alen, 164
Gligorov, Kiro, 56
Glogova: refugees to Bratunac, 106–7; Serb attack on, 153–54
Gojkovic, Drinka, 145
Goldhagen, Daniel, 11, 12
Golubović, Dušan, 125
Goražde, confiscation of personal military documents in, 83
Gow, James, 61, 63, 64, 70, 80, 82
Greater Serbia, 22, 26, 35, 47, 55
Grujić, Branko, 94, 207*n*66
Guilt evasion, 145–46, 151–53
Gunjaci bauxite mine, 97
Gutman, Roy, ix, 123

Hague Convention of 1899, 118
Halberstam, David, 175
Han-Pijesak, confiscation of personal military documents in, 83
Haračić, Indira, 180, 223*n*1
Harland, David, 171
Hartmann, Florence, 109
Hasečić, Bakira, 117, 122, 129, 131
Hate speech, 65
Hayes, Vere, 141
HDZ. *See* Croatian Democratic Union
Heath, Edward, 174
Hemon, Aleksandar, 44
Herman, Edward, 175–76
Hilberg, Raul, 87
Hitler, Adolf, 144
Hitler's Willing Executioners (Goldhagen), 11
Hoare, Marko, 25, 55, 173
Hodžić, Nedžad, 103, 134, 215*n*273
Hollingworth, Larry, 136
Holocaust, 4–7. *See also* Nazi Germany
"Homogenous Serbia" memo, 22
Horowitz, Gordon, 151
Horowitz, Irving Louis, 8, 9
Hovannisian, Richard, 132
Hulsizer, Michael R., 165
Hutchinson, John, 40

ICJ. *See* International Court of Justice
ICTR. *See* International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda

ICTY. *See* International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia
Idea linkage distortion, 173, 180–81
Ideology: analytical framework, 7–10; indoctrination of, 11; social control via, 12; and Višegrad genocide, 129–31
Imamović, Mustafa, 23
IMF (International Monetary Fund), 27
Indictments: for Bratunac genocide, 108–10; of Deronjić, 108; of Nikolić, 97, 101
Indigenous peoples, 7–8
Induced famine strategy, 138–42
Inflation, 29
Intellectuals: in Bratunac, 101; and Bratunac genocide, 102–3; scholarly denial of genocide, 172–76; and Ustasha movement, 45
Interhamwe, 205*n*28
International Court of Justice (ICJ), 64, 176–77
International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR), 3–4, 116–17
International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY): and Babić prosecution, 201*n*44; and Deronjić prosecution, 101, 108–10, 169–70, 210*n*135; establishment of, ix–x; and Genocide Convention, 3–4; irregular forces defense used in, 87; and Krajišnik prosecution, 199*n*16; Milošević case, 37; and Nikolić prosecution, 100, 101; *Orić* case, 152, 168, 200*n*41, 202*n*66, 202*n*71, 203*n*103, 208*n*91; settlement of cases by, 109, 169
International Military Tribunal Charter, 2
International Monetary Fund (IMF), 27
Irredentists, 17
Irwin, Rachel, 183, 214*n*242
Isaković, Nadža, 113
Islam between East and West (Izetbegović), 25
Islamic Declaration (Izetbegović), 25
Islamization, 23
Isolation, fear of, 166–68
Izetbegović, Alija, 25, 50, 52–56, 96, 194*n*44

Janša, Janez, 32
Jaspers, Karl, 145, 154
Javnost on Neretva River, 81
Jeleč, Serb attack on, 120–21
Jevtić, Miroljub, 47, 197*n*104
Jews: dehumanization of, 10; and victim psychology, 133. *See also* Nazi Germany
JNA. *See* Yugoslav People's Army
Johnson, Richard, 175
Joint criminal enterprise, 50–80; and authoritarianism, 72–73; and Bosnia occupation, 50–54; and democratization, 50–54; and Dobanovci meeting, 78–80; and financing of genocide, 76–78; and independence of Bosnia, 54–57, 62–64; JNA's role, 69–76; media's role, 64–69; and paramilitary forces, 72–76; and police forces, 72–76; and rhetoric of genocide, 54–57, 64–69; Serbian plan of aggression, 57–62; and special forces, 72–76
Jonassohn, Kurt, 5, 8
Jones, Adam, 8
Jones, John, 149, 150
Josipović, Milan, 127
Jović, Borisav, 54, 195*n*66
Jusić, Džemo, 103, 134, 215*n*273

Kadijević, Veljko, 54, 73
Kajuga, Jerry Robert, 205*n*28
Kallay, Benjamin, 24, 194*n*38
Kapetanović, Mehmedbeg, 194*n*38
Kapo, Ago, 114
Karađorđević, Aleksandar, 21, 192*n*20
Karađorđevo: Milošević/Tuđman 1991 meeting, 55; Tito's 1971 dismissals, 19
Karadžić, Radovan: and arming of Serb population, 104; crisis headquarters communications with, 60; and Dobanovci meeting, 78–80; on Drina

Karadžić, Radovan (*continued*)
  River's strategic importance, 83; and JNA reorganization, 69–70; and Kosovo myth, 44; as leader of Serbian Democratic Party, 52, 102; and Pale meeting, 107–8; and propaganda, 48, 49; prosecution of, 65; and RAM plan, 62; and rhetoric of genocide, 54, 55; and Sarajevo siege, 63; and SDS, 59; and Serb regionalization, 53; and special forces, 76; and Srebrenica genocide, 69, 138–39; on strategic goals for Serbs, 66, 67; and Zvornik genocide, 90
Karchmar, Lucien, 193*n*26
Kardelj, Edvard, 20, 29, 33
Katz, Stephen T., 4
Kecmanović, Nenad, 51
Kertes, Mihalj, 104, 209*n*107
Khmer Rouge, 3
Kiernan, Ben, 7–8
Kladanj, Bosniak refugees deported to, 100
Kljujić, Stjepan, 52, 56
Kohl, Helmut, 33
Kolenović, Sabra, 135, 137–38
Koljević, Nikola, 54, 63
Kontić, Radoje, 79
Kosovo: Albanian nationalism in, 17–18, 28; and dissolution of Yugoslavia, 28; Kosovar Albanians, 22, 30, 37; "Ranković Era," 17–18, 27. *See also* Kosovo myth
Kosovo and Metohija (KiM), 34
Kosovo myth, 39–44; Battle of Kosovo (1389), xiv, 40–42; and dissolution of Yugoslavia, 30–36; "The Mountain Wreath" epic poem, 43–44; and propaganda, 161
Koštunica, Vojslav, 179
Kovač, Radomir, 116, 122
Krajina, 53
Krajišnik, Momčilo, 53, 55, 60, 199*n*16
Križevica River, 135
Krleža, Miroslav, 19
Krstić, Radislav, 69, 175
Kučan, Milan, 34
Kučar, Savka Dabčević, 19
Kukanjac, Milutin, 63, 74
Kulenović, Osman, 45
Kulin, Ban, 23
Kunarac, Dragoljub, 116, 122
Kuper, Leo, 5, 6, 7
Kupres, Serb attack on, 64
Kurspahić, Kemal, 51
Kušić, Rajko, 112, 114, 115

La Brosse, Renaud de, 37–38
Land Without Justice (Đilas), 155, 156
Languages, 19
Laqueur, Walter, 148
Lasić, Đorđe, 22
Lauer, Reinhard, 44
Lazar, Prince, 39, 40, 41–42, 44
League of Communists of Bosnia and Herzegovina, 51
League of Communists of Yugoslavia, 34, 71
League of Communists–Social Democratic Party (SK-SDP), 51
Leibers Code of 1863, 118
Lelek, Borivoje, 116
Lelek, Željko, 184
Lemkin, Raphael, 1–4, 15, 121
Lepa Brena concentration camp, 122
Levene, Mark, 8
Lewis, Bernard, 4, 172
Liplje concentration camp, 91–92
Loevinger, Jane, 160, 163, 167
London Agreement (International Military Tribunal Charter), 2
Looting, 87, 90, 92, 105, 130
Ludwig Boltzman Institute for Human Rights, 90, 94
Lukić, Milan, 126, 128, 183–84
Lukić, Sredoje, 128, 184

Macedonia: JNA troops in, 56
Macedonian Communist Party, 25, 192*n*16
MacKinnon, Catharine, 123
Madley, Benjamin, 8

Magaš, Branka, 81
Malcolm, Noel, 23, 25, 193*n*26
Mamula, Branko, 32, 72, 73
Mann, Michael, 9, 175
Marcus, Greil, xvii
Marjanović, Jovan, 194*n*41
Market socialism, 26
Marković, Ante, 51, 61
Marshall Plan, 27
Marx, Karl, 166
Mass graves, 130
Matić, Slavka, 151, 162
Mauthausen concentration camp, 151
Mazowiecki, Tadeusz, 33, 92
MBO (Muslim Bosniak Organization), 52, 56
McCauley, Clark, 6
Media: on Bratunac genocide, 106; censorship of, 19; and joint criminal enterprise, 64–69; and Kosovo demonstrations, 31; liberalization in, 19, 32; Milošević's control of, 51; and propaganda, 36–39; reports of genocide in World War II, 170; and rhetoric of genocide, 65; and Sarajevo siege, 63
Medical care denied to Muslims, 129–31
Mehmed-paša Sokolović Bridge, 127, 130, 223*n*3
Meholjić, Hakija, 135
Mihailović, Draža, 22, 119, 124, 193*n*28
Mihailović, Vasa, 40
Mihajlović, Kosta, 199*n*20
Mijatović, Stojka, 130
Mikulić, Branko, 25
Miladinović, Dragomir, 161
Milgram, Stanley, 12, 13, 49, 146
Milići Brigade, 99
Milošević, Dragomir, 171
Milošević, Milutin, 106
Milošević, Slobodan: antibureaucratic revolution of, 34; and Bosnian independence, 57; and financing of wars, 77–78; and JNA reorganization, 54, 73; Karađorđevo meeting with Tuđman (1991), 55; and Kosovo, 30–36, 42; on paramilitary forces, 75; partitioning plan for Bosnia and Herzegovina, 55, 199*n*20; and propaganda, 36–39, 47–49; prosecution of, 65, 176; and RAM plan, 62; rise to power, 16, 28; and SANU memo, 29, 35; and Slovenia, 33; and special forces, 75–76
Milovanović, Manojlo, 90
Minarets, destruction of, 85
Mistaken identity defense, 152–53
Mitrović, Milenija, 149, 150, 162
Mitrović, Petar, 184
Mladić, Ratko: and Dobanovci meeting, 78–80; and Pale meeting, 107–8; prosecution of, 65, 177–78; and rhetoric of genocide, xii, 82; and special forces, 76; and Srebrenica genocide, 139; on strategic goals for Serbs, 67, 68
Modern Jihad as War (Jevtić), 197*n*104
Moljević, Stevan, 22
Morillon, Philippe, 139, 140
Moses, Dirk, 8
Mosques, destruction of, 85, 111, 121, 128
"The Mountain Wreath" (Njegoš), 43–44, 155, 158
Mujkanović, Efendi Mustafa, 105
Murad, Sultan, 40
Musić, Adem, 98
Musić, Muhamed, 98
Musić, Mustafa, 98
Muslim Bosniak Organization (MBO), 52, 56
Muslims: in Bosnia and Herzegovina, 17; medical care denied to, 129–31; national identity for, 20–26. *See also* Bosnian Muslims (Bosniaks)

Načertanije (The Outline) memo, 21
Narodna odbrana (secret organization), 157

National Bank of Republika Srpska (NBRS), 77
Nationalism: cultural, 40; as motivator for social crisis, 9. *See also* Serbian nationalism
NATO, x, 195*n*47
Nazi Germany: citizen involvement in, 11; concentration camps used by, 132, 133–34, 215*n*269; Croatia's alliance with, 22; dehumanization of victims in, 10; denial of genocide in, 149; irregular forces in, 75; paramilitary forces in, 203*n*88; rape not used as tactic in, 116; Serbia's alliance with, 22
NBRS (National Bank of Republika Srpska), 77
Neretva River, 81
Neue Slowenische Kunst movement, 32
New York Times on genocide in Nazi Germany, 170
Nice, Geoffrey, 62, 76, 201*n*44
Nikolić, Dragan "Jenki," 95, 97, 99–100, 101, 147, 218*n*35
Nikolić, Momir, 152
Nikolić, Tomislav, 178
Njegoš, Petar II Petrović, 43–44, 155, 158, 161
Nolte, Ernst, 172
Novi Most, 127
Novi Sad Corps, 106
Nož (Drašković), 48
Nuremberg Laws, 93, 116
Nuremberg trials, 2

Obedience to authority, 13–14
Obilić, Miloš, 41
Official Gazette of Serb People, 61
Ogata, Sadako, 140
Okanović, Miloš, 162–63
Olovo, confiscation of personal military documents in, 83
Omerović, Mesud, 137
Ordinary Men (Browning), 11
Organization phase of genocide, 14
Orić, Naser, 135, 152, 168
Orthodox Church, 39, 40, 43–44, 48, 78, 93–94
Osmanović, Ibro, 147
Ostojić, Velibor, 107–8
Ottoman Empire: and Battle of Kosovo, 40–42; forced famine as weapon of, 132; Islamization under, 23; paramilitary forces in, 86; Rogatica history during, 111; and Serbian national identity, 21–22
Owen-Stoltenberg plan, 68

Pale concentration camp, 106
Pan-Islamism, 25
Paramilitary forces: in Bratunac, 105; and joint criminal enterprise, 58, 72–76; role of, 9; in Rwanda, 86, 205*n*28; in Višegrad, 126, 129; in World War II, 203*n*88; in Zvornik, 86, 88–90. *See also specific units*
Partisan movement, 46–47
Party of Democratic Action (SDA), 52, 96, 119–20
Party of Democratic Renewal (Slovenia), 34
Patarin heresy, 23
Patković, Salko, 98
Paunović, Dragoje, 114–15
Pavle, Patriarch, 79
Peer group pressure, 11
Pejanović, Mirko, 53
Pejić, Marko, 94
Pelivan, Jure, 53
Peterson, David, 175–76
Petrović, Nikola, 153
Phases of genocide, 14–15
Piskavice, Serb attack on, 98
Planning: of Bratunac genocide, 101; of Serb aggression, 82; of Zvornik genocide, 90–95
Plavšić, Biljana, 54, 60, 63, 118
Pluralist societies, 164
Poland: fall of Soviet regime in, 33; Jewish resistance forces in, 133; Nazi concentration camps in, 215*n*269
Polarization phase of genocide, 14

Police forces: in Bratunac, 105–6; and joint criminal enterprise, 72–76; mobilization of, 82; in Rogatica, 112; in Višegrad, 125–26; in Zvornik, 90–91
Political dissidents, 17
Political guilt, 145
The Politics of Genocide (Herman & Peterson), 175
Poljo, Ćamil, 115, 164
Popović, Branko, 94
Popović, Nikola "Cojka," 152, 153–54, 162, 168, 218*n*35
Popović, Pero, 101
Porter, Jack Nusan, 8
Power, Samantha, ix, 3, 84, 173
Pozderac, Hamdija, 198*n*5
Preparation phase of genocide, 14. *See also* Coordination; Planning
The Prevention of Genocide (Kuper), 6
Prijedor: attack on, 64; Serb control of, 68; Serb tactics in, 84, 176
Propaganda: and denial of genocide, xiv, 177–78; and dissolution of Yugoslavia, 36–39, 47–49; principles of, 37–38; and rhetoric of genocide, 65–69; and Serbian aggression plan, 59; and Serbian nationalism, 37, 71; of victimization of Serbs, 28–29
Property rights, 93
Prosecutions: of Babić, 201*n*44; for Bratunac genocide, 108–10; of Deronjić, 101, 108–10, 169–70, 210*n*135; of Karadžić, 65; of Krajišnik, 199*n*16; of Miloševič, 65, 176; of Mladić, 65; of Nikolić, 100, 101; of Paunović, 114–15
Public Accounting Services, 69
Purves, J. J., 140

The Question of Guilt (Jaspers), 145

Radio stations, 83, 93, 102. *See also* Media
Radio Zvornik, 93
Ramet, Sabrina, 48
RAM plan, 61, 64
Ranković, Aleksandar, 17, 18, 24
"Ranković Era," 17–18, 27
Rape: in concentration camps, 100, 113, 121–22; orders to, 122–24; systematic nature of, 123; as tactic of genocide, 117–19; in Višegrad, 128; as war crime, 117–19
Rašković, Jovan, 48–49, 196*n*67
Rasput Njive, saviors in, 147, 163–64
Ravno, 54, 56
Ražnatović, Željko (Arkan), 89, 104. *See also* Arkan's Tigers
Red Berets, 76
Redžić, Enver, 45
Redžić, Izet, 96, 97
Refugees, 136, 139
Regionalization, 53, 58
Reljić, Nikola, 105, 107
Republic of the Serb People of Bosnia and Herzegovina, 61
Republika Srpska: creation of, 61; and rhetoric of genocide, 64; and Srebrenica genocide, 64–65
Rescuers. *See* Saviors
Research and Documentation Center in Sarajevo, 188*n*1
Restorative justice, 109–10
Riedlmayer, Andras, 85
Rijs, Bart, 209*n*120
Rogatica genocide, xiii, 110–16; confiscation of personal military documents in, 83; demographics of, 204*n*8; and human shields, 113–15; and saviors, 115–16
Romania, fall of Soviet regime in, 33
Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, 117–18
RTS (Serbian state radio television), 178
Rwanda: child soldiers in, 95; dehumanization of victims in, 10; ethnic nature of genocide in, 5; irregular forces

in, 75; paramilitary forces in, 86, 205*n*28; rape used as tactic in, 116; scapegoat theory in, 165; U.S. response to genocide in, 170

Šabanović, Murat, 126
Salihović, Zaim, 215*n*273
Sandžak region, 17, 23
Sanski Most, Serb attack on, 176
SANU. *See* Serbian Academy of Science and Arts
Sartre, Jean-Paul, 150–51
Savčić, Milutin, 81
Savić, Živorad, 129
Saviors, 111, 115–16, 146–48, 217*n*9
Scapegoat theory, 164–65
Schomburg, Wolfgang, 108–10
Scorched-earth policy, 98–99
Scorpions unit, 76, 177
SDA. *See* Party of Democratic Action
SDB (State Security Service), 76, 103
SDS. *See* Serbian Democratic Party
SDS Crisis Staff, 208*n*99
"Second guilt," 145
Secret police, 17
Šekovići, confiscation of personal military documents in, 83
Sells, Michael, 42
Serbia: Constitution (1990), 34; denial of genocide in, 176–79; and dissolution of Yugoslavia, 19; JNA command power concentrated in, 31–32
Serbian Academy of Science and Arts (SANU), 28–29, 33, 35, 48, 61
Serbian Communist Party, 29
Serbian Democratic Party (SDS): arming of Serb population by, 103; and Bratunac genocide, 102–3; and Foča genocide, 119–20; JNA cooperation with, 52, 207*n*76; and mobilization of police forces, 82; and paramilitary forces, 74; and Rogatica genocide, 112; and Sarajevo siege, 63; and Serbian aggression plan, 58–60; and Vlasenica genocide, 96
Serbian Guard, 48
Serbian nationalism: and Bratunac genocide, 102–3; cultural, 40; and denial of genocide, 147; and dissolution of Yugoslavia, 18; and Muslims portrayed as traitors, 23, 24; and propaganda, 37, 71
Serbian Radio and TV, 65
Serbian Refugees Committee, 94
Serbian Secret Service, 76
Serb Population Crisis Staff, 208*n*99
Šešelj, Vojislav, 76, 89, 178, 193*n*28
Shaw, Martin, 4, 15, 173
Shelling. *See* Artillery shelling
Simatović, Franko, 76
Sinanović, Mevludin, 215*n*273
SK-SDP (League of Communists–Social Democratic Party), 51
Sliwinski, Marek, 132
Slovenia: JNA conflict with, 32, 35–36
Slovenian Communist Party, 34
Smailović, Suad, 134–35, 136
Smith, Geoffrey Johnson, 174
Smith, Roger, 10, 76
Smith, Rupert, 75, 171
Social Democratic Party, 63
Social patterning, 167
Sokolac, confiscation of personal military documents in, 83
Soviet Gulag, 133
SPE (Stanford Prison Experiment), 12–13
Special Elite Units, 74
Special forces: and joint criminal enterprise, 72–76; in Zvornik genocide, 94. *See also specific units*
Srdić, Srdo, 68
Srebrenica genocide, xiii, 131–43; and "actions for food," 137–38; and Bosniak resistance, 137–38; confiscation of personal military documents in, 83; demographics of, 204*n*8; disarming of Bosniaks in, 105; geostrategic importance of, 134–36; ICJ on

Srebrenica genocide (*continued*)
  responsibility for, 64–65, 176; induced famine strategy used in, 138–42; Mladić's role in, 78–80; prewar atmosphere, 134–36; shelling of city, 140–42; and "war to extermination" doctrine, 142–43
Stambolić, Ivan, 29, 30
Stanford Prison Experiment (SPE), 12–13
Stanić, Milenko, 97
Stanišić, Jovica, 76
Stanton, Gregory, 14, 173
State Commission for Gathering Facts on War Crimes, 98
State Security Service (SDB), 76, 103
States of Denial (Cohen), 153
Staub, Ervin, 219*n*61
Sudan: child soldiers in, 95; rape used as tactic in, 116
Sudetic, Chuck, 157, 159
Sušica concentration camp, 95, 99–101
Svilanović, Goran, 179
Symbolization phase of genocide, 14

Tadić, Boris, 179
Tanasković, Darko, 197*n*104
Tanjug News Agency, 78
Ten Years' War in Cuba (1868–1878), 132
Territorial Defense (TO) units: and Bratunac genocide, 105, 106; in Krajina, 62; role of, 70, 84–86; and Zvornik genocide, 89, 92, 94
Tešić, Hajan, 98
Time-sequence confusion, 173
Tito, Josip, 16–20, 24, 46, 70, 72–73
TO. *See* Territorial Defense units
Todorović, Kosta, 157
Tolerance, 164
Tomašević, Jozo, 193*n*26, 197*n*98
Torkildsen, Morten, 77
Torture, 98, 105, 121
Trbušće, Serb attack on, 121
Tripalo, Miko, 19
Trnovača, Serb attack on, 121
Tucaković, Šemso, 112, 124–25
Tuđman, Franjo, 19, 34, 52, 55, 199*n*20; Karađorđevo meeting with Milošević (1991), 55
Turajlić, Hakija, 68
Turhan Emin-bey Mosque, 121
TV Belgrade, 93

Ujić, Mile, 113
Ukraine, forced famine in, 131–32
Unemployment, 103
Union of Reform Forces of Yugoslavia (SRSJ), 51
Union of Three Republics plan, 68
United Kingdom, inaction by, 174–75
United Nations: and Cambodia genocide, 189*n*11; and Croatia war, 50; and Genocide Convention, 3; ICTY deadlines set by, 109; Legal Committee, 3; and Srebrenica genocide, 137, 139, 140–41; and Višegrad genocide, 126, 127; and Zvornik genocide, 92
United States: and Abu Ghraib prison abuse, 13; and Genocide Convention, 3; inaction of, 35–36, 85, 170, 174–75; pluralism in, 164; scapegoat theory in, 165; Tito's security pact with, 26–27
U.N. Protection Force (UNPROFOR), 139, 171
Upstanders. *See* Saviors
Ustasha movement, 45, 46, 88, 157
Ustić, Akif, 135
Uzelac, Nikola, 62
Užice Corps, 125, 126

Vance, Cyrus, 50
Vance-Owen plan, 57
van Luisien, Kadir, 209*n*120
Varda furniture plant, 128
Vasiljević, Mitar, 126, 128, 129, 183–86
Vasiljević, Radomir, 129
Vegh, Ferenc, 75
Vejzović, Hasib, 98
Vejzović, Himzo, 98
Vejzović, Šaćir, 98

Vercoe, Kym, 181–87
Veselinović, Sveto, 112
Victim psychology, 133
Vilina Vlas Hotel, 128, 182
Višegrad genocide, xiii, 124–31; arming of Serbs for, 125–26; attack on, 64; burning people alive in, 128–29; confiscation of personal military documents in, 83; demographics of, 125, 204*n*8; Drina River used in, 127–28; geostrategic importance of, 124–25; and ideology, 129–31; JNA's role in, 125–26; and medical care denied to Muslims, 129–31; paramilitary forces in, 74
Vještica, Miroslav, 68
Vlasenica genocide, xiii, 95–101; confiscation of personal military documents in, 83; demographics of, 96, 204*n*8; geostrategic importance of, 96–97; paramilitary forces in, 74; Serb attacks on city and surrounding villages, 64, 97–99; and Sušica concentration camp, 99–101
Vojvodina, 17, 20, 29
von Weizsäcker, Richard, 145
Vreme on RAM plan, 61
VRS (Army of the Republika Srpska), 75, 138–39
Vuk Karadžic school (Bratunac), 105–6
Vukovar, 35, 142
Vuković, Zoran, 116, 122
Vulliamy, Ed, ix, xii, 127, 130, 173

War Commission of the Bratunac Municipality, 102
"War to extermination" doctrine, 142–43
Washington Agreement (1994), 200*n*24
Western, Jon, 84
White Eagles, 76, 89, 105, 126
Woodward, Susan, 73
Woolf, Linda M., 165
World War I, 22, 118
World War II: Foča genocide as repeat of pattern from, 119–21; forced famine as weapon in, 132; historical factors in dissolution of Yugoslavia, 45–47; paramilitary forces used in, 203*n*88; rape used as tactic in, 118, 119, 125; Rogatica history during, 111–12; theft of individual property in, 87; Višegrad history during, 124–25

Yugoslav Muslim Organization, 24
Yugoslav People's Army (JNA): and Bratunac genocide, 105, 106, 107; control over, 64, 72–73; and Croatia war, 50; and mobilization of police forces, 82; and paramilitary forces, 74; Ravno offensive, 56; reorganization of, 31–32, 54, 69–72, 195*n*66; role in genocidal plan, 72–76, 84–86; and Sarajevo siege, 63, 64; SDS cooperation with, 207*n*76; and Srebrenica genocide, 134, 142; and Višegrad genocide, 125–26; and Vlasenica genocide, 96, 97; and Zvornic genocide, 89

Zaklopača, Serb attack on, 98
Žbanić, Jasmila, 187
Zekanović, Jovan, 98
Zekić, Goran, 103–4, 136
Zelenović, Dragan, 123
Žikić, Slavoljub, 138
Zimbardo, Philip, 12–13, 146
Živanović, Milenko, 134–35, 143
Zombardo, Philip, 49
Zulfikarpašić, Adil, 52
Zvornik genocide, xiii, 86–95; attack on, 64; confiscation of personal military documents in, 83; demographics of, 88, 204*n*8; geostrategic importance of, 87–88; paramilitary forces in, 88–90; planning and coordination of, 90–95; Serb residents participating in violence, 88–90; Serb tactics in, 84
Zwaan, Ton, 10, 14